INFANT-BAPTISM;

OR,

Infant-Sprinkling;

(As the Anabaptists Ironically term it,)

Asserted and maintained by the *Scriptures*, and Authorities of the *Primitive Fathers*.

Together with a

REPLY to a pretended ANSWER.

To which is added, A

SERMON

PREACHED

On Occasion of the Author's baptizing an Adult Person. With some Enlargements.

By *J. R.* Rector of *Lezant* in *Cornwal*.

LONDON,

Printed, and are to be Sold by *J. Taylor*, at the *Ship* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard; *Philip Bishop* at *Exon*, and *Benjamin Smithurst* at *Launceston* in *Cornwal*, 1700.

INFANT-BAPTISM;

OR,

Infant-Sprinkling;

(As the Anabaptists Ironically term it,)

Asserted and maintained by the *Scriptures*, and Authorities of the *Primitive Fathers*.

Together with a

REPLY to a pretended ANSWER.

To which is added, A

SERMON

PREACHED

On Occasion of the Author's baptizing an Adult Person. With some Enlargements.

By *J. R.* Rector of *Lezant* in *Cornwal*.

LONDON,

Printed, and are to be Sold by *J. Taylor*, at the *Ship* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard; *Philip Bishop* at *Exon*, and *Benjamin Smithurst* at *Launceston* in *Cornwal*, 1700.

To the Worſhipful

Sir *Joſeph Tredenham*, Kt.

'*TIS not unknown, how you have vouchſafed to eſpouſe my Cauſe in many difficulties I have ſtruggled with. Which is very much my Glory, that ſo eminently worthy and accompliſht a Perſon, and ſo great a Votary of the Church of* England *as Your Self, hath not ouly judged favourably, but on many occaſions actually intereſted your ſelf on my behalf. It therefore behoves me to lay hold on any opportunity to demonſtrate a grateful Mind, tho' it be accompanied with a new Addreſs for further Favour, as this at preſent is, to countenance a ſmall Polemical Diſcourſe; for I cannot but call to mind, having ſo well experienced its truth in you, that known Aphoriſm, which a Reverend Prelate lays down in the cloſe of his Parable of the Pilgrim*: Thoſe will be our beſt Friends, not to whom we have done good, but who have done good to us; *which ſpeaks the abounding goodneſs of a Benefactor. Upon this ground I take the confidence of making this Dedication. 'Twould be tedious to recount to you the various Motives that have induced me*

thus to engage in this Controverſie, when ſo many Tracts have been already ſet forth of this Nature; it may ſuffice to clear me from all aſperſions, that I can juſtly ſay from the Obſervation of others, as well as my own, that 'tis, like the Quakers, a growing Sect with whom I contend; and that they have lately, in my Pariſh of Up-Ottery, *built them a Synagogue of ſuch a Structure, as if they meant it ſhould out-vy the Parochial Church there. Theſe things, I humbly conceive render it neceſſary, and make it my more peculiar Province, to endeavour with others to ſtop the growth of the Faction, that ſo my own Flock may not be worried and miſs-led; but that I may be aſſiſting to them in my neceſſary abſence, as well as when I am preſent amongſt them; and by any means reduce ſome, and prevent others from going aſtray from the holy Communion of our Church, whoſe Peace and Proſperity all its true Members, eſpecially the Clergy, ought to Conſult and Promote. Sir, my Prayers and Endeavours are intent upon theſe Things, and as far as I continue ſtedfaſt in ſuch labours, I am ſecure of your good Opinion,*

Your moſt Obliged and

moſt devoted humble Servant,

James Roſſington.

INFANT BAPTISM;

OR,

Infant Sprinkling, &c.

INfant Baptiſm, or, as the Anabaptiſts ſometimes call it, Infant Sprinkling, is no Popiſh Tradition, much leſs is it, as they pretend, brought into the Church by *Innocent* the Third, yea ſo far is it from being any corrupt Innovation crept into the Church, that it agrees with the mind of God in the holy Scriptures; and conſequently we need not queſtion its agreeableneſs to the practice of the Church of Chriſt even in the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity; tho' it ſhould be ſuppoſed we have no expreſs Records of matter of Fact, which yet we have, and the ſame authentick and undeniable. Neither is our way of adminiſtring Baptiſm, by pouring on of Water novel, or to be diſlik'd.

Cornwal's Vindication of the Royal Commiſſion of King *Jeſus*. Dedicated to the Houſe of Commons, about the Year 1645 and *A. R.* in his Vanity of Childiſh Baptiſm.

To demonſtrate the agreeableneſs of this Doctrine to the revealed Will of God, I ſhall take my riſe from the Covenant God made with *Abraham* *, being by the Apoſtle's computation †430 years before the giving of the Law. And to this he elſewhere refers ‖, where he ſignifies that the Goſpel was before preached to him, that is to ſay in the words of the Promiſe, as containing in them a Breviary thereof, being

* Gen. 12. 3. 17. 8.
† Gal. 3. 17.
‖ Gal. 3. 8.

an Evangelical and not a legal Promiſe, *viz.* That all Nations of the World, and not only the Jews, ſhould be juſtified by Faith, and conſequently the Gentiles now; and that without legal Moſaical performances; for after this manner, and in theſe expreſs words, did the Promiſe run: *In thee ſhall all the nations of the earth be bleſſed*, and again, *I will eſtabliſh my Covenant to be a God unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee* *. And when God had thus enacted and eſtabliſhed his Covenant with that holy Patriarch and his Seed; he immediately thereupon, as you'l find †, commanded them to keep that his Covenant, not only in the ſubſtance, but in the ſign and token of it, as 'tis immediately in one continued Speech exegetically added, *this is my Covenant*, or token of my Covenant, ſo that the ſenſe and meaning of the Phraſe in either Verſe, is clearly the meaning of both, and Circumciſion is ſpecified to be the Covenant at that time to be kept, tho' not the only Covenant to be kept.

* Gen. 17. 8, 9.

† ver. 10.

Vid. Dr. *Burthog's* Argument for Infant Baptiſm, Printed *Anno* 84. and *Whiſton's* Infant Baptiſm plainly proved, Printed *Anno* 78.

The Obligation impoſed upon *Abraham* and his Seed was, as you may note in the firſt Place, to keep the ſign or token of the Covenant, or the Covenant in the ſign of it; and then to obſerve Circumciſion as that ſign or token. The former is of perpetual Obligation; the latter is more poſitive and ſecondary. Tho' then there be an alteration in the ſecond Injunction; it will not therefore follow, there muſt be in the firſt; or that the Covenant ought not to be obſerved in the ſign of it; if for certain reaſons Circumciſion be no longer, but ſomething elſe be that ſign. So in the fourth Commandment, *Remember the Sabbath*

Sabbath-day to keep it Holy, that is the firſt thing which is principally Commanded; but the other the ſeventh Day, that is the laſt Day of the Week, is the Sabbath, that is but ſecondary, ſo that the Obligation to the firſt, and that which is primary in the Command doth not ceaſe, becauſe there is an alteration in the ſecond, and that not the ſeventh, but the firſt is now the Sabbath of the Lord.

For a further explanation of this Truth, you may obſerve, that the Command in the 9th verſe requires the keeping of the Covenant in general, but don't determine what the token of the Covenant ſhould be, but obligeth to whatſoever token God ſhould inſtitute; 'tis not ſaid, Thou ſhalt be circumciſed, or be baptiſed, but thou ſhalt keep my Covenant; that is, as afore, the token of the Covenant; conſequently when Circumciſion was appointed, it obliged to that; but Circumciſion being laid aſide, and another ſign inſtituted, which is Baptiſm, it now obligeth to this; ſince the Command in general is not revoked, but only the ſign is alter'd. Wherefore the Command at firſt not determining the ſign what it ſhould be, but only enjoyning the keeping of it, whatſoever it ſhould be, and being applicable to Baptiſm, as well as to Circumciſion, and extending and reaching to all *Abraham*'s Seed, to believing Gentiles as well as to the Jews, 'tis all one, as if God had ſaid: Thou ſhalt Circumciſe under the firſt Teſtament, and Baptize under the ſecond. Theſe being Tokens of the Covenant ſucceſſively to be kept the one after the other.

And this Covenant being renewed to the Children of *Iſrael* in the Land of *Moab*, (beſides the Covenant which *Moſes* made with them in *Horeb* *) the command runs in theſe Terms: That they ſhould all, even their little ones, enter into this Covenant, that is explicitely by ſome Rite or other; not that the little ones could then perſonally and expreſly indent with God, or that a perſonal or expreſs Stipulation was a Condition prerequiſite to their Initiation; but only an implicit, or vicarious, or an imputative ſort of Stipulation by Sureties or Witneſſes, as the old Teſtament word is †; which at Years of underſtanding they were bound to own by the reſtipulation of a good Conſcience, or by an open Profeſſion of the Jewiſh Religion.

*Deut. 29. 1.

† Iſa. 8. 2. vid. *Jun.* and *Trem.* on the place.

The manner then of entring into Covenant with God, or keeping the Covenant in the ſign or token of it, was by receiving of Circumciſion. Accordingly in the 17th of *Gen.* aforeſaid, *Abraham* and the reſt were circumciſed in the Capacities they were in, *Abraham* at 99 Years old, and *Iſmael* at 13, and the Children, as they were commanded. Neither did this Law concern only ſuch as belonged unto *Abraham* for the preſent, and his Poſterity, but alſo *Proſelytes* that in future times were to be received or adopted into his Family; even to the time of *John* the Baptiſt and Chriſt, who were both circumciſed the 8th Day, that is during the firſt Adminiſtration, *ſo long*, ſays God, *it ſhall be for a ſign between me and you*, ‖ viz. Thoſe that belong to thee, with thy ſelf for the preſent, and thoſe that ſhall deſcend from thee according to the Fleſh, or be adjoyned unto thee; he adds not

‖ Gen. 17. 11.

and

and thy Seed after thee; which hints that Circumciſion was no longer to be the ſign, but till the Seed ſhould come. Whereas ſpeaking of the Covenant without limiting it particularly to Circumciſion, he ſays, *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant, thou and thy ſeed after thee, in their generations*; and again, *This is my Covenant which ye ſhall keep between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee.* Nevertheleſs the Seed Chriſt myſtical, the believing Gentiles in after Ages, are as abſolutely enjoyn'd to keep the Covenant in the ſign of it, as the others. Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant *; *Q. d.* thou and all that thou owneſt, and thy Seed and all that they own, ſhall by way of Stipulation be dedicated unto me; and that in token of being ſo, both you ſhall obſerve the Covenant, by wearing the Initiating ſign thereof your ſelf in your own Perſon; and by put it on all yours as far as they are capable of receiving it, which ſhall be virtually and interpretatively the puting it on all thy Seed, † all ſuch as have the benefit or advantage of the Covenant ſhall keep it in like manner, cauſing their Children and ſuch as they adopt to wear the like Badge and Cognizance, the initiating Sign and Seal. And as it cannot be ſuppoſed, but that the believing Gentiles do retain a propriety and right for their Children, and that under the Goſpel they are as much theirs, and in the ſame right, as the natural and adopted Children (together with the Servants and Slaves) of *Abraham* were his; ſo neither is it to be denied, but that as

* Ibid. v. 9.

† *The whole Nation of the Jews are called the Circumciſion, the Women being reckoned to be circumciſed in the Men, and were permitted to partake of the Paſſover of which no uncircumciſed Perſon could eat,* Exod. 12. 47, 48.

Circumciſion was the initiating Rite and Sign before the coming of Chriſt; ſo Baptiſm is after it: And that now to dedicate and give up a Perſon unto God viſibly and ſolemnly, is by that Sign or Rite to enter him into the Church; and that the command of keeping the Covenant in the ſign of it, or of ent'ring into Covenant, according to the Rite that ought to accompany it, is ſtill neceſſary, and lays an Obligation upon all to whom the Covenant extends.

Now how far the Covenant reacheth, the Apoſtle declares at large, *Act.* 2. 39. where he infers the ſame Concluſion, and on the like Premiſes, as I have done, *viz.* The Right of ſuch Perſons, and conſequently their Children's right to Baptiſm; and the Obligation that is incumbent on Parents to have it adminiſtred; becauſe the Promiſe of the Covenant extends to poſterity, without limiting it to thoſe who were immediately and perſonally called, as the Anabaptiſts would have it, but it belongs to them, and in them to their Children; without any Condition or Qualification on their part, ſave only their being Children of ſuch Parents. Nor can we interpret the Apoſtle, by reaſon of that laſt Clauſe in the verſe, *even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call*, to have meant or intended any perſonal Call required, as to Children in order to Baptiſm; unleſs we make him in effect guilty of very groſs Tautologies: for ſhould that be neceſſarily implied, with reſpect to the ſeveral particulars aforegoing, it would make the Apoſtle ſpeak to this Purpoſe; The Promiſe is to you that is, to as many of you as God hath called, and to your Children, even to as many of them as God hath called; and to all afar

far off which God ſhall call, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call; the impoſing ſuch a ſenſe, I ſay, on the Apoſtle's words, would render him very vain and Tautological; much leſs is there an inward Call abſolutely neceſſary for every particular Perſon, in order to his ſuſception of Baptiſm, or indeed for any, but only an outward Call of the Parents ſufficeth; not only in reference to themſelves, but to thoſe Minors likewiſe who are under their Power; for 'tis not neceſſarily requiſite, that the party to be baptiſed, muſt be ſuppoſed to have an abſolute Right to the *Rem fœderis*, to what is promiſed in the Covenant, but only to the conditional Grant or Covenant, as that ſpeaks a mutual Engagement each to other. There being no ſuch thing as a right in *foro Eccleſiæ*, contradiſtinct to the right in *foro dei*; no one having a right to Sacraments in the judgment of Charity, who hath none in the ſight of God. If it be otherwiſe, how ſhall we have the Church's judgment, concerning the Individuals that are to be admitted unto Baptiſm, or the Lord's Supper? I hope they will not ſend us to *Rome* for it; and there is not any general Council in being to decide the particular Caſes, or any Court where the whole do ſend in their Votes. And the like may be ſaid of a National Church; if it be meant of a Congregational Church, or rather particular Congregation, then this muſt be of the whole Body too, or the judgment of the Ruler or Rulers; if the whole Body, we know there are many in moſt Congregations, that never troubled their Heads about it; and ſcarce know their own Minds, what they would or ſhould judge in ſuch matters; and few of thoſe that uſe this

diſtinction, did ever take their judgement in it; if it be meant of the Paſtors and Rulers, then it ſeems the Pope is not very much out of the way, to count himſelf, at leaſt with his Cardinals, to be the Church; if a ſingle Presbyter or Deacon with the ruling Elders may be the Church. Surely they come nearer to him, than they are aware of, who account the judgment of a particular Congregation, or Paſtor, the judgment of the Church; and plead that a Man hath a right to the Sacrament, if that Congregation or Miniſter judge ſo; tho' he hath none in the ſight of God. But here is the Miſchief of it, by this reckoning a Man may have a right in the judgment of the Church, and yet have no right in the judgment of the Church; for he may have a right in the judgment of one Miniſter or Congregation, and yet another may at the ſame time judge, that he hath no right at all. But which ſhall be the Church of the two? Why certainly the one hath as good right to claim the Title, as the other; except one of them rob the Pope, and claim the Chair, and condemn all other Churches and their judgment, to ſet up their own. The Eaſtern Churches were ſo wary to prevent all Thoughts that one's right to the Sacrament ſhould in any wiſe depend on the Miniſter, that they ſay not *baptizo*, but *baptizetur N. in nomine Patris*, &c. Thus the Apoſtles baptiſing is ſaid to be Chriſt's Baptiſm. 'Tis true, the Miniſter in ſaying I Baptize thee, ſpeaks right; but ſtill he baptizeth as a Miniſter, and cannot call that his Baptiſm; but if the Miniſter's Act be all that ſuch Profeſſors have right to, then he might ſay they have no other but my Baptiſm, and that the party hath right to his Baptiſm, and not Chriſt's. Wherefore the

better

better to underſtand any one's fundamental Right in this Point, we muſt diſtinguiſh between the Grant or Promiſe, and the mutual Engagement which is in Covenants, and ſo muſt allow that the natural Seed of *Abraham*, by virtue of God's gracious Promiſe, were in ſome ſenſe to be reputed a ſpiritual Seed likewiſe; tho' not ſo ſtrictly, as to create to them an abſolute right to the benefits of the Covenant, the bleſſing of *Abraham*; yet enough to give them thePrerogative of being in Covenant, and the Priviledges of being under ſuch an Adminiſtration; whereof the Apoſtle reckons eight which belonged to the Jews *; And who will ſay, that Chriſtians have fewer and of leſs Conſequence? Don't we find thoſe very Perſons whom the Baptiſt (upbraiding them for coming ſo far ſhort of *Abraham*'s Faith and Works) calls a Generation of Vipers, admitted by him to Baptiſm, and enſtated in the aforeſaid priviledges? †

* Rom. 9. 4, 5.

† Luk. 3. 7. *and* v. 16.

From theſe premiſes, it apparently follows, that not only believers, but profeſſors of Chriſtianity and their Children are proper Subjects of Baptiſm; yea ſuch alſo as are born of profeſſed Infidels, when they become Converts, and belong to ſuch as are Members of the viſible Church, for ſo runs the primitive Grant; and to theſe doth the Covenant extend, *Gen.* 17. And if profeſſing Jews, and ſuch Servants and Slaves as are mentioned, *v.* 13. have a right to enter into the Covenant, and to be circumciſed; it follows, *à fortiori*, that the Children of profeſſing Chriſtians, and ſuch as they have a propriety in, have a true right to the like priviledge, and are now to be baptized, otherwiſe the Goſpel

ſpel doth not, nor muſt Chriſtians ſhew ſo much favour to the Children of the Jews, as the Covenant under the Law did, and as the Jews were to ſhew to the Children of the Gentiles, while they were ſtrangers in the general to the Common Wealth of *Iſrael*. And if when they were in the Scripture account ſtrangers to the Covenant, yet ſuch Children of theirs might enjoy it, how much more now ſince the Partition-wall is taken down, and the enmity is done away ?

Nor is this true only in the Theory, and according to the Commandment, as it may be thus fairly conſtrued ; but the Practice of the Church, Age after Age, ſpeaks this to be the intent of the Law, *& Lex currit cum praxi.* So that for Men to exclude them now, as if they were greater Aliens and Forreingers than they were at that time ; to ſhut them out from the Covenant and Seal more than when they were under the Law, and to make a greater Partition-wall between Gentiles and Gentiles, than there was then between Jews and Gentiles, (as thoſe muſt do that debar them of their Right to Baptiſm) this muſt needs be contrary to the Goſpel ; and doth in effect make void the Croſs of Chriſt for tho' upon the coming in of the Goſpel the ſign be changed, and Circumciſion, which was at firſt the ſign and token of that Covenant, be taken away ; it doth not follow, that the Obligation to obſerve and keep the Covenant in any other Sign and Token doth ceaſe with it, for the reaſon and equity of the Command doth hold in Baptiſm, as well as in Circumciſion, *& Ratio legis & nexus conſcientiæ* are reciprocal, and do mutually ſuppoſe one

one the other. And this is the Topic that St. *Paul* uſeth, * arguing for the maintenance of the Evangelical Miniſtry, from the Analogy of Faith, and reaſonableneſs of the thing. * 1 Cor. 9. 8.

We are therefore to diſtinguiſh between the Obligation to keep the Covenant in the Sign and Token of it, which is of perpetual Obligation and Exiſtence, as the Covenant it ſelf is; and to keep it in the particular ſign and token of Circumciſion, which being ſecondary and changeable, for certain Reaſons was to be no longer, but ſomething elſe became that Sign and Token.

For the further explanation of this, 'tis to be noted that Circumciſion was not aboliſhed in the Goſpel, as 'twas of the Fathers, but as it was of *Moſes*; (a diſtinction that Chriſt himſelf makes †) not as it had relation to the Covenant of Promiſe, and the Sign of it, as if in that reſpect, it was a weak and carnal Thing; for ſo it was a Bond to Evangelical Obedience ‖; but as it was adopted by the legal Mediator, and made a ſign of that Adminiſtration and Covenant in which he had to do. Wherefore if the Law ceaſed, Circumciſion could not continue; ſeeing whoſoever was circumciſed became a Debtor to keep the whole Law; and ſo it would infer, as if Chriſt were not come in the Fleſh. † Joh. 7. 22

‖ Gen. 17. 1. *that is be upright and ſincere, ſo the Margin,* Rom. 2. 25. Gal. 5. 3.

Nor can the abrogation or ceſſation of Circumciſion be underſtood to be any diminution to the Promiſes; foraſmuch as it was applied to the Legal Covenant out of a gracious Conſideration, (as Doctor *Burthog* well obſerves) not in the derogation of the Promiſes, or of any Priviledges or Duties ariſing from thence; but in confirmation of them;

God

God taking the token of the Covenant of Promiſe, and putting it upon the Legal Covenant, ſhews he had the Covenant of Promiſe ſtill in remembrance; for doing ſo he could never look on, or ſo much as think on the Law, but he muſt alſo remember the Promiſe, the ſign and memorial of the Promiſe being thus annexed and put to the Law. So that here is an expreſs command for baptizing Infants or little ones; tho' not in the very term Baptiſm, yet under this general Notion, as 'tis now the oken of the Covenant, for God's Covenant with *Abraham* ſtill continues, 'tis
* Gen. 17. 7. an everlaſting Covenant, * in which bleſſedneſs was promiſed in and thro' Chriſt the promiſed Seed; and by virtue, whereof the bleſſing of *Abraham*, or the Promiſe made to that Patriarch, in like manner came on the Gentiles, as the Apoſtle aſſerts, *Gal.* 3. 14. therefore 'tis ſaid, the Goſpel was preached
† Ib. v. 8. to *Abraham* †; and as it was long before the Law, and not diſannull'd by the coming of the Law; ſo 'twas to endure till the Seed ſhould come, to whom the Promiſe was made; and conſequently to the end of the World; becauſe Chriſt came to eſtabliſh the Covenant
‖ Rom. 15. 8. made to the Fathers ‖.

Now if the Covenant be the ſame, the Promiſes of it muſt needs be continued in the ſame Tenure in which they were at firſt made, and run in the ſame latitude and extent, taking in Children with their Parents; unleſs God himſelf had made any alteration or reſtriction, or paſſed any Act of Excluſion. But 'tis remarkable, the Apoſtle doth not ſay
* Act. 2. 39. the Promiſe was, but is *: And the Grace of the Goſpel is now more ample than before under

under the Law; being then in its ordinary Diſpenſation appropriated to the Jews; they were God's Favourites to whom his Grace in Chriſt was manifeſted; but now it reacheth to the Gentiles alſo, having appeared to all Men, to all ſorts and ages. Surely therefore Infants being in Covenant then are not to be excluded now, which if they be, let it be ſhew'd how and when they were ejected? How this *Magna Charta* came to be forfeited? How they, who were once Members of the myſtical Body, came to be cut off? The Common Wealth indeed of *Iſrael* is at an End, and the Scepter is departed from *Judah*, but the Olive-tree the Church continues, tho' under a different Adminiſtration; the Partition-wall is broken down, but the very Church is not deſtroyed. And for this ſee and conſult *Rom.* 11. where the Apoſtle compares the Jews to an Olive-tree, and the rejecting of them for a ſeaſon, to the lopping off its natural Branches, as Branches which bore no Fruit; and the calling of the Gentiles he reſembles to the grafting upon that old Stock; which growing again a-freſh makes up one entire Olive-tree, whoſe Root and Branches are nouriſhed by the ſame Sap; which Similitude plainly intimates, that Jews and Chriſtians make up but one Univerſal Church, of which our Lord Jeſus is the Head; and that Faith in him is the Sap, which gives Life and Nouriſhment to it; the conſequence whereof is this, that the ſame Spiritual Priviledges, which belonged to the Children of the Jews, do belong to the Children of Chriſtians; and that if the former were to be initiated into the Church by Circumciſion, ſo are

the

the latter by Baptiſm; for being of the ſame Church, and within the ſame Covenant, they ſhould receive a-like the Seal thereof, which tho' now changed from Circumciſion to Baptiſm, yet the Church and Covenant is the ſame ſtill; and therefore Church-memberſhip is as extenſive, and comprehends Infants under the Goſpel, as it did once under the Law; and unleſs a Law can be ſhew'd, which confines Infants Church-memberſhip to the Jewiſh-State, and excludes them the Chriſtian; there is no reaſon why we ſhould be frighten'd from our laudable Practice of initiating Infants into the Chriſtian Church.

What ſaith our Saviour, *Joh.* 3. 5. If one be not Born again of Water and the holy Ghoſt, he cannot inherit the Kingdom of God: Where we ſee not only the unregenerate are excluded Heaven, but as the Text is interpreted * by ſome, even the unbaptized, with reſpect to the ordinary means of Salvation, and ſo far forth as the omiſſion of an inſtituted Rite, or poſitive Duty may be ſaid to do ſo; now foraſmuch as we cannot be too ſure, but that this may be the true ſenſe of the Place, and the mind of our bleſſed Saviour; and ſeeing he ſpeaks it indefinitely, we cannot know for certain but he had reference to unbaptized Infants, as well as others; therefore unleſs God had plainly declared his Mind againſt the baptizing of ſuch, and expreſly excluded them

* Niſi enim renatus fuerit ex aquâ & ſpiritu Sancto non poteſt introire in regnum dei utique nullum excipit non Infantem non aliquâ præventum neceſſitate. D. Abroſ. de *Abrah.* Patriarch. *l.* 2. *c.* 11. vid. etiam de voc. Gent. *l.* 2. *c.* 8. & D. Aug. *l.* 10. de Gen. ad literam, *c.* 14. *We hold, ſays Biſhop* Andrews, *the ſame neceſſity of Baptiſm, that the Fathers did hold, which is* Viâ ordinariâ, *yet* non alligando gratiam dei ad media, *no more than the Schoolmen do. Biſhop* Andrew's *Anſwer to* Peron, *p.* 12.

them from that Ordinance; how can we chuſe, out of mere compaſſion and zeal for their Salvation, but adminiſter it to them? Though then there be ſome ſo prepoſſeſt with prejudice, that they cannot ſo earneſtly believe with our Church, the intereſt Children have in Baptiſm, yet ſince their not ſo believing cannot alter the Infant's Caſe, neither can they be ſo ſure, but, as it hath been ſaid, they may be comprehended in that of St. *John*, according to the aforeſaid Interpretation; therefore upon that other principle expreſt by our Church, in the ſame Paragraph *, they ſhould look upon it as a charitable Work to bring ſuch to Baptiſm.

* *Vid. Office for publick Baptiſm, in the expoſition upon the Goſpel.*

But to return to the Argument, and to illuſtrate it, and render it more convincing; ſuppoſe there were an Act of Parliament, wherein certain civil Priviledges are granted to all Engliſh Subjects, and their Children, without any limitation of time for their continuance, and afterwards there comes a New Act of Parliament, wherein more and greater Priviledges are granted to all Engliſh Subjects, without mentioning the former, or their Children; thoſe former Priviledges are held by all Lawyers to belong ſtill to all Engliſh Subjects, and their Children, becauſe all ſuch Acts, and the beneficial Clauſes thereof, are ſtill in Force, 'till they are repealed by the ſame Authority and Power that made them; neither will it ſuffice to ſay, that the Priviledge here granted is in a Teſtamentary way, and the making a New Teſtament is a vertual repealing any former Will or Teſtament, ſo that ſuppoſing this was a Legacy bequeathed to the Jewiſh Church by Chriſt's Teſtament,

yet

yet foraſmuch as 'tis not granted by Chriſt's laſt Will and Teſtament, which we call the Goſpel, or the New Teſtament, the Priviledge ceaſeth of it ſelf. But this Compariſon is faulty, and will not hold: For the Old Teſtament, or (as it is by way of diſtinction, with reference to that Miniſtration ſometimes called) the Law and the Goſpel, tho' they differ in Circumſtantials, yet are not two Wills of Chriſt, but for ſubſtance one and the ſame Will and Teſtament, even the ſame Covenant of Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; or if you will, the Goſpel in reſpect of the Law, is like a Schedule or Codicil to a Will, the adding ſome further Legacies not already given, and no Legacies that were bequeathed in the foregoing Will can be cut off, except they be particularly recalled in the Codicil; in like manner Infants Church-membership muſt remain in force under the Goſpel, except it be the Will of Chriſt it ſhould ceaſe, and he had declared as much in the Codicil of the New Teſtament; but no ſuch thing appearing there, proves it ſtill in force.

'Tis not denied but that the Collective Body of the Jews were broken off from the Church thro' unbelief *, that is by reaſon of their poſitive infidelity; whereby they did directly and openly diſown and reject the true Meſſiah; yet all of them were not, there were many thouſands, or as the word is, Myriads of the Jews, that believed; as the Scripture witneſſeth †: Neither were the reſt broken off, but the believing Gentiles were inoculated in amongſt them ||, till they profeſſedly rejected Chriſt, and were become open Enemies

*Rom. 11. 20.

† Act. 21. 20.

|| Grotius *on* Rom. 1. 17.

mies to his Goſpel; now it would be unreaſonable to infer, that all the Infants were broken off, for the infidelity of ſome of the Parents. The elect Jews, which obtained Mercy, kept their Station, and ſo muſt needs be conceived to retain their Priviledges for themſelves and theirs; otherwiſe they would become loſers, to what they were before the exhibition of Chriſt, in reſpect of their Infant Seed; for they who were before within and wore the Badge of the Covenant, ſhould afterwards be without, and deprived of that Dignity, and 'tis the general received opinion and even of ſome Anabaptiſts, * that what Priviledges the Nation of the Jews had before their Rejection, the ſame ſhall they recover with an advantage at their Reſtoration, † and to ſay the Geniles ſhall not have the ſame Covenant-Priviledges with them, is to make a difference, and ſo ſet up a Partition-wall, when as the Apoſtle aſſerts || both Jew and Grecian, Male and Female are all one in Chriſt *.

* *This is granted by* Harriſon, *in his* Pædo *Baptiſm oppugn'd, as he is cited by* Geree *in his* Vindiciæ Vindiciarum, *pag.* 20.

† Hoſ. 2. 23. Rom. 11. 25, 26. || Gal. 3. 28. * Act. 8. 12. *which ſhews the Apoſtle's Practice in the Caſe. And the reaſon on which it was grounded, you have,* Gal. 3. 28. fore-quoted.

Summarily and briefly excluding Children out of the Covenant, and debarring them of the Sign, put a ſacrilegious reſtraint thereon, and excludes them from the ordinary way of Salvation; for if they have no viſible intereſt in the Covenant, in regard of God's viſible diſpenſation, then they have no viſible intereſt in Chriſt, they are no way related to him, who is the Mediator of the Covenant; we conclude therefore, that the aforeſaid Law of

keeping the Covenant, and of entering into the Covenant, is as much in force as ever; and we are ſtill bound to obſerve the Covenant and the token of it, that is after the manner of its Adminiſtration, for the time being; if the Sign be changed, the Caſe is not altered, our Obligation continues the ſame: Now Baptiſm is the initiating Ordinance, as afore, when Circumciſion was the Token.

Not but that there is a difference in the Adminiſtration, *viz.* That whereas the Females are as ſuſceptive of the Rite of Baptiſm as the Males, therefore 'tis equally and as diſtinctly to be adminiſtred unto them *. Neither hath God taken any order in that Caſe of Infants, to tie us to adminiſter it, preciſely on the 8th Day; no more then he hath done in the Caſe of the adult or actual Believers; whether immediately upon their believing, or the next Day, or the Day after; but the Goſpel indulging a diſcretionary Latitude, in both Caſes it may be done ſooner or later, provided we do not out of a profane or careleſs humor procraſtinate it; as St. *Cyprian* argues in his Epiſtle to *Fidus* †, there being no neceſſity why we ſhould delay their Baptiſm, but rather that we ſhould haſten it all we can; ſo long as I may add, we become not alike Superſtitious with the Church of *Rome*, who in danger of

* *See our warrant for this*, Gal. 4. 9, 10.

† *Epiſt.* 58 *the query was about baptizing Infants before the* 8*th Day*, Fidus *did not deny Infant Baptiſm, but only denyed the baptizing of them till then, to which the Father returns this Anſwer, that both himſelf and the Council with him, which conſiſted of* 66 *Biſhops, unanimouſly determined, that a Child might be baptized as ſoon as he was Born, whereupon St.* Auſtin *ſpeaks to this effect that St.* Cypr. *did not make any new Decree, but obſerving the faith and practice of the Church, judged with his own fellow Biſhops, that as ſoon as one was Born, he might be lawfully baptized.*

Ut parvuli ſi infirmari contingat eodem die quo nati ſunt bpatizentur. Concil. Gerund. Can. 4. *yea in*

of Death, do it e're the child is fully Born into the World ‖. And conſequently with ſo much precipitancy, as ſpeaks their laying too much ſtreſs (as their manner is) upon the *Opus operatum*, and as if God ties himſelf to means as well as us.

danger of Death, in ipſâ hora, *ſays* Greg. *l.* 12. *Epiſt.* 10. apud Magdeb. *Cent.* 6. *c.* 6. *Col.* 367. *and* Ina *King of the Weſt* Saxons *made a Law that Infants ſhould be baptized within thirty Days after their Birth, under the penalty of thirty ſhillings, a great ſum in thoſe Days*, Leg. Inæ, *c.* 2. apud Spelm. Concil. Ang. *Tom.* 1. *p.* 183. Quicunque parvulos recentes ab uteris Matrum baptizandos negat Anath. ſit Concil. Milevit. Can 2. apud Magdeb. Cent. 5. c. 9. col. 835. & Caranz. fol. 123 *being the* 11 Conc. *in the* African Code, *confirmed by the 4th and 6th general Council.* ‖ Si timeatur de morte Infantis antequam naſcatur & caput ejuſd. appareat extra uterum infundat aquam quæ adfuerit ſuper caput naſcentis, dicens, Ego te bapt. Synod. Colon ſub Rudolpho Imper. apud Magd. Cent. 13.

Agreeable hereto, Chriſt's Commiſſion is as full for baptizing Infants, as any others; for if they be the natural or adopted Children of Believers, or ſuch as are proſelyted; they are *Abraham*'s Seed; and ſo are intereſted in the Covenant, and belong to Chriſt, which in Chriſt's own Dialect is the ſame thing with being his Diſciples *. Yea they are called ſo by the Holy Ghoſt †. And the Commiſſion runs to Baptize all Diſciples ‖. Go Diſciple all Nations, baptizing them—— if then Infants be or are made Diſciples, together with their Parents or Proparents; ſo as the Promiſe of *Abraham* reacheth to them, they are to be baptized; for there is nothing to interpoſe between diſcipling and baptizing. Yea ſuch is the near conjunction of the Commands, that they ſeem to be coincident. *q. d.* Whoſoever are my Diſciples or Relatives, Partners of the Covenant, or are in the Church's Power to ſtipulate for

* *Compare* Matt. 10. 42. *with* Mark 9. 41.

† Act. 15. 10. *with* v. 1.

‖ Matt. 28. 19. Μαθητεύσατε.

their Religious Education; let them be conſigned thereunto by this Sacrament of Baptiſm; let this be the Rite of their Admiſſion; let this be the Badge and Cognizance of their Diſcipleſhip; and who are we, that dare, in contradiction to this expreſs order of our Saviour, hinder any ſuch out of our own Imaginations from entering in at this ordinary Gate or Door of Grace, who do not exclude themſelves?

Ananias finding *Saul* in the ſtate of a Diſciple baptized him * tho' neither, he nor any Miniſter elſe had made him ſo. Infants are Diſciples, not ſo much of Man's as of God's making, vouchſafing graciouſly in their believing Parents, to accept them alſo into his Covenant †, and ſo into the State of Diſciples.

* Act. 9. 18.

† Rom. 11. 16. 1 Cor. 7. 14.

The Apoſtle alſo plainly declares, that intereſt in the Promiſe is alone by it ſelf, a ſufficient ground for the application of Baptiſm, in that he exhorts thoſe awaken'd Jews to be baptized upon this Ground, or for this reaſon, that the Promiſe did belong to them ‖. 'Tis true, he exhorts them to Repentance, to which Faith muſt be conjoyn'd, as neceſſary to their intereſt in the Promiſe, but 'twas their intereſt in the Promiſe, on which he Grounds his Exhortation to them to be baptized. Hence however Perſons come to have an intereſt in the Promiſe, whether it be by deſcent, or adoption, or by their own perſonal Faith and Repentance, 'tis all one to our preſent purpoſe. And this is agreeable to the firſt Command to keep the Covenant, that is the token of the Covenant; the Command is grounded upon intereſt in the Promiſe,

‖ Act. 2. 38, 39.

Gen.

Gen. 17. 9. *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant therefore*, (that is, upon this Ground) becauſe the Promiſe is unto thee, and having the Promiſe, thou ſhalt wear the Sign and Seal thereof; for it follows, *à majori ad minus*, that the Children being in Covenant ſhould not want the Sign and Seal that enſures the Benefits and Priviledges of the ſame. *Who then can forbid Water*? 'Tis the Apoſtle's Argument * to thoſe that have received the Grace of God, the Promiſe, by Virtue whereof they are in Covenant with God as well as we.

* Act. 10. 47.

Now what have the Anabaptiſts to Object againſt what is here alledged for the putting on Infants the preſent Sign or Token of the Covenant? Why nothing in effect, but what they are beholden to the Papiſts for, *viz.* That Circumciſion was the Token only of a Carnal Legal Covenant, and that ſuch was the Covenant which God made with *Abraham* and his Seed; and renewed by *Moſes* to the Children of *Iſrael*; and that its being a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith was peculiar only to that Patriarch, and that there is no ſuch thing now as *fœderal* holineſs, or any Right or Priviledge accruing by vertue of any Promiſe or Covenant from Birth, or by being of ſuch a Lineage, or Deſcent, but that the Children of Believers in their Infant Eſtate, are in no better Condition than thoſe of Heathens.

'Tis ſtrange that they, who in ſhew are ſo much againſt Popery, ſhould broach ſo much of it, ſpeaking the Language of *Rome*, againſt the Proteſtant Doctrine, maintained in the Church of *England*. is this to come out of *Babylon*, thus to ſide with the Papiſts, and *Bel-*

*De Sacr. effectu. l. 2. c. 13. & alibi.

† *Answer to* Tombs, *p.* 61. *Printed* Anno 46.

larmine * in particular? Mr. *Blake* † declares, that their Arguments against fœderal Holiness are borrowed from them; and that he hath not met with any, either in Mr. *Tombs* or *Blackwood*, which may not be found in *Stapleton*, *Cornelius a Lapide*, the Rhemists, or some of that Party; and that the Jesuits were the first Opposers of it.

'Tis likewise a great and much agitated Controversie, between the Papists and those of the Reformed Religion concerning the Identity and Efficacy of *John*'s Baptism compared with Christ; the Papists thundering *Anathema*'s against them, who shall affirm the Baptism of *John* to have the same vertue and power with that of Christ: Those of the Reformed, on the other side are generally of Opinion, that *John*'s Ministry was the same that was afterwards delegated to the Apostles. And his Baptism the same, which was afterwards ministred by them. This the Anabaptists deny, to take occasion there-from to Ground their dipping again, or Rebaptization; and to this purpose draw most of their best Shafts out of the Popish Quiver, and form most of their choicest Weapons on their Anvil; yea in the whole conflict they have been necessitated to borrow help from these Philistine Artists. But let them, if they can, produce any thing in the whole Bible, to overthrow what is here laid down; otherwise what I have retorted on them must be acknowledged to be very just.

Neither is there any doubt, but that the Practice of Christ's Church hath been answerable to the Doctrine here represented.

They

They ſay there is not any expreſs Inſtance of any Infant baptized in the whole Hiſtory of the Goſpel; but is there any inſtance of any Infant of a Chriſtian believer left unbaptized? Are there not ſtrong Preſumptions that upon coming over of any to the Faith, their Children together with themſelves, were received and baptized; 'tis ſaid only of *Lydia* that ſhe believed, but of her and her Houſhold that they were baptized *; yea our Saviour himſelf, upon *Zaccheus*'s receiving of him, ſays, *to Day is Salvation come to thy Houſe, foraſmuch as thou alſo art the Son of* Abraham †. So St. *Peter* told *Cornelius* words, by which he and his Houſe ſhould be ſaved ‖. Thus it was promiſed to the Gaoler, that on his Faith not only himſelf ſhould be ſaved but his Houſe, and upon his Profeſſion he was baptized, and all that were his, or all that belonged to him *; therefore not only the major Part of his Family, according to the falſe and corrupt Gloſs of the Anabaptiſts, but ſimply and abſolutely all that lived under his Roof.

* Act. 16. 15.

† Luk. 19. 9.

‖ Act. 11. 14.

* Καὶ οἱ αὐτῦ πάντες, Act. 16. 31, 33.

Moreover how reaſonable is it to believe that there were Children in thoſe Families, as part of the Houſhold, for the word Houſe or Houſhold in Scripture, ſignifies Children eminently, being the principal Materials, *Ben* a Son, and *Bath* a Daughter, do both come from the Root † *Banah* which ſignifie to build, and figuratively to procreate Children, and ſo to build an Houſe or Family. Thus God promiſing to give Chil-

† בן *Filius*, בת *Filia à radice* בנה *edificavit Metaphor. de liberorum procreatione*, Deut. 25. 9. *Buxt.* So *Gen.* 16. 2. Margin, be built by her; *Sept.* τεκνοποιήσομαι ἐξ αὐτῆς.

dren

dren unto *David*, is pleaſed to expreſs himhimſelf in this Phraſe, *I will build thee an Houſe*, becauſe Children under God do build up the Houſe, and keep up the name of their Father's Family, and ſo to build an Houſe or Family, being the ordinary Inſtruments as to perpetuate and continue, and hold up the Houſe in Natural and Civil, ſo in Religious and Eccleſiaſtical Reſpects likewiſe; accordingly the Apoſtle directing a Biſhop to rule his Houſe well, preſently names Children * as the moſt conſiderable part of his Charge and Care. Wherefore, as it often falls out, when ſome parts of the Family are expreſly inſtanced in, and the nomination of Children omitted, they are nevertheleſs intended and included, as *Gen.* 14. 16.

*1 Tim. 3. 4.

Neither do we read of any laid aſide or excluded from Baptiſm upon the account of their Non-age, yea 'tis highly probable that thoſe Children, yea ſucklings, as the original Word imports, which were brought to Chriſt with a deſire in them that brought them, that he ſhould lay his hands on them, had been already baptized; now 'tis ſaid expreſly that he laid his Hands on them †, but we never read in the *N. T.* of the laying on of Hands on any unbaptized Perſons, unleſs perhaps it were in order to the working ſome miraculous Cure ‖; In all other Caſes, impoſition of Hands was practiſed on baptized Perſons * only, and the reaſon given by Chriſt to his Diſciples, why they ſhould countenance and further rather then reſtrain their Acceſs to him ſufficiently evinceth, that they were brought upon a ſpiritual Account rather than for any bodily Cure.

† Luk. 18. 15. παβρέφη, *in a former Tranſlation Babes*,

‖ Mark 10. 16.

* *See* Mark 8. 23. 16. 18. Luke 4. 40. 13. 13. Act. 9. 17. 28. 8.

And

And as a further Argument to ſhew, that the practice was Apoſtolical, I may add hereto the Teſtimonies and Suffrages of the Ancient Fathers *a*, both of the Greek and Latine Church. *Origen* affirms in expreſs Terms, that the Church from the Apoſtles days, received a Tradition to Baptize Children *b*, and that Baptiſm is to be given unto Infants, according to the Tradition of the Church *c*; who yet was contemporary (according to *Oſiander* and *Funeſius* account) with *Tertullian*, neither could *Tertullian* himſelf be ſo ſottiſh, as to oppoſe an imaginary abuſive practice of having Sureties, or *Hyginus* Biſhop of *Rome* before him, to order as he did about the Guardianſhip of Infants, in appointing ſuch who ſhould promiſe for their religious Education in that Faith whereinto they were batized *d*, if the baptizing of them was not a thing in uſe before, and ſo an Apoſtolical ordination derived down to them, and from them tranſmitted to the Church, where the practice of it hath been uninteruptedly continued ever ſince. Why ſhould *Tertullian*, I ſay, affright Perſons from being Suſceptors to Infants in their Baptiſm, by the Hazard they ran in their Childrens liableneſs to Death and to Diſtempers, if no ſuch thing were in his time? It had been dangerous to ſtart ſuch a Novelliſm if never before practiſed. St. *Auſtin* writ a Tract of Infant Baptiſm *e*, and ſays the Church always had it, always held it *f*. *Juſtin Martyr*, who lived as they calculate in St. *John*'s Days, in his unqueſtionable Works gives ſeveral hints for Infant Baptiſm *g*. *Irenæus* ſpeaks of Infants being Born again, that is by the Laver of Regeneration, *viz.* Bap-

a Vid. *Caſſander* de bapt. *of the Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches.*

b *In his Comment on the Epiſt. to the* Rom. *c.* 6. *l.* 5.

c *In his* 8 Homil. *on* Levit.

d *See* Platina *in the life of* Hyginus *the 8th Pope from St.* Peter *according to* Caran.

e De Bapt. parvulorum.

f Semper. habuit, ſemper tenet, *in his* 5 *Serm.* de verb. Apoſt.

g *As in his Dialogue with* Tryphon, *part* 2. *prop.* 3.

Baptiſm as Dr. *Hammond* underſtands it *h*. *Nazianz*. is for it not only in danger of Death, but ſimply and abſolutely, expreſſing himſelf to this purpoſe, Haſt thou a Child, let it be baptized from an Infant, let it be early conſecrated to the Spirit *i*. St. *Baſil* gives Teſtimony to it, anſwering the Queſtion, whether Infants may be baptized, in the Affirmative; for ſo, ſays he, we are by the Circumciſion of Children inſtructed, there being a parity of reaſon as for the circumciſing of Children *k*. *Voſſius* makes the Teſtimony of St. *Cyprian*, in his Epiſtle *l* to *Fidus*, (which for its authenticalneſs is quoted by *Nazianzen*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Ambroſe*, *Jerom*, *Auſtin*, and others *m*) beyond all exception, and *Grotius* ſays it makes the matter plain that there was then no doubt of Infant Baptiſm; accordingly the *Magdeb*. bring in *Origen*, *Cypr*. and other Fathers to avouch the Practice, to have been even in the time of the Apoſtles *n*. Now what ſays St. *Auſtin*, touching ſuch immemorial uſages, as the Catholick Church holds, and ever hath held, and have not come into uſe by the Inſtitution of any Council, that they are ſuch as are rightly believed, to have been delivered down to us, by no leſs than Apoſtolical Authority *o*, and leſt there ſhould be any wreſting of his words, *viz*. *Traditum ab Apoſtolis*, or Apoſtolical Tradition, he peremptorily affirms, (ſpeaking of the Church's Authority in this Caſe of *Pædobaptiſm*) that it was without all queſtion delivered by the Lord and his Apoſtles *p*.

h Irenæus *l*. 2. *c*. 29. *Dr*. Ham. *reſolution*, Sect. 4. pag. 212.

i Orat. 3. and 40. *in* S. Lavacr.

k l. 3. contra Eunomium. 58.

1 *Epiſt*.

m Vid. Naz. Orat. 3. *in* S. Lavacr. Chryſoſt. Homil. ad Neoph. Ambr. *in* Luc. Hieron. *l*. 3. Dialog. contr. Pelag. Auſt. *in his* 28 *Epiſt. to St*. Jerom, *in his* 14 Serm. de verb. Apoſt. *in his Book*, de peccat. merit. & remiſſ. *and in his* 3 *Book*, c. 5.

n Cent. 3. c. 4. pag. 57.

o In Donat. *l*. 4. *c*. 23. *calling it an Eccleſ. Cuſtom or as he explains himſelf, an Apoſtol. Tradition*, ſe de Geneſi ad literam, *l*. 10. *c*. 23. *and his* 3 *Epiſt*. *to* Voluſiam. p *l*. 1. De peccat. merit. & remiſſ. *c*. 16. Proculdubio per Dominum & Apoſtolos traditum.

The

The word Tradition, the Fathers understood not in the Popiſh Senſe, for that which hath been delivered in Doctrine from Age to Age, above what is written, to ſupply the ſuppoſed defect of the Scripture, but for the very written word it ſelf, by which they delivered the truth, and for their examples and report thereof, tending to the explication of their Doctrine, and not to the adding any new Doctrine.

Calvin affirms the baptizing of Infants to be a holy Inſtitution obſerved in Chriſt's Church *q*. All the Reformed Churches, uſe it, as you may ſee by the Harmony of their Confeſſions *r*. The Greek Church, (who yearly excommunicate the Pope,) Baptize their Infants *s*; ſo the *Cophti* or native Chriſtians of *Egypt* who have no Communion with the *Roman* Church. And the practice being ſo general and Primitive; *Eraſmus* wondered what evil Devil entered them, who denyed the Baptiſm of Children uſed in the Catholick Church above 1400 Years, and he might the rather for that it hath been the general Conſent, and almoſt univerſal Practice, not only of all Chriſtendom, but of all the World; Jews, Gentiles, Mahometans, Chriſtians of all Sects; Proteſtants, Papiſts, *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Muſcovites*, *Mengrelians*, *Indians* of St. *Thomas*, *Abyſſines*, *&c.* as a modern Author obſerves, to uſe ſome ſolemn initiating Ceremony to admit their Children, not yet adult, into the Society and Communion of their Religion.

q Inſtit. 4. *c.* 16. Sect. 6.

r Th. à Jeſu de Converſ. omnium Gentium, *l.* 7. *pag.* 506.

s *Pagit of Hereſies*, pag. 17.

Theſe

Theſe Authorities, (with others cited in the Margin *) I lay down as I might have done many more, not to tye the Baptiſm of Children to the Teſtimony of Men; but as a Martyr for the Proteſtant Religion did, to ſhew how Mens Teſtimonies do agree with God's Word *w*, and that Antiquity is on our ſide, and that the Anabaptiſts have nothing but falſe and new Imaginations, who feign the Baptiſm of Children to be the Pope's Commandment, or any late Invention or Innovation.

* Conſtit. Clementis, *there* 'tis βαπτίζετε δ' ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια. *Baptize your Infants*, l. 6. c. 19. Concil. Melevit. can. 2. apud Magdeb. Cent. 5. cap. 9. col. 835. & Caranz. *fol.* 123. Ambroſ. l. de *Abrah. Patriarch.* Hier. contra Pelag. *lib.* 3. Ut Chriſtus Infantes ad ſe venire juſſit, ita nec Apoſtoli eos excluſerunt à Baptiſmo & quidem dum baptiſmus Circumciſioni æquiparat. Paulus Col. 2. aperte indicat etiam Infantes per baptiſmum Eccleſiæ dei eſſe inferendos, &c. Magdeb. Cent. *l.* 2. *c.* 4. Magdeb. Cent. 2. *'tis ſaid*, nec uſquam legitur Infantes hoc ſeculo à Baptiſmo remotos eſſe. *We don't read they were then excluded Baptiſm*, c. 4. p. 48. de Baptiſmo; *nor as 'tis ſaid, until the 6th Cent. when 'twas excepted againſt by one* Adrianus. *That* Terull. *himſelf was for Infant Baptiſm appears, in that in his Book'* De anima cap. 39. *He preſſeth it when the Child is in danger of Death, and gives his reaſon*, lib. de Bapt. *cap.* 12. præſcribitur nemini ſine Baptiſmo competere ſalutem. *Council of* Trullo, *Can.* 48. *requires that all the Grecian little ones, without delay ſhould be baptized. One of the* 8 *Cannons in the Council of* Carthage *concluding againſt* Pelagius *decreed, that whoſoever denyed Baptiſm for the remiſſion of ſins to a new Born Infant, ſhould be anathematiz'd, ſee* Craggs *Arraigment and Conviction of Anabaptiſm againſt* Tombs, *pag.* 85. Photius, *a learned Greek, produceth an Imperial Conſtitution, wherein it was decreed that all baptized Samarit. and Grecians ſhould be puniſhed, who brought not their Children to holy Baptiſm*, apud Craggs, ibid. w *In a Letter that Mr.* Philpot *writ, whilſt he was in Priſon.*

Nor is our manner of adminiſtring this ſacred Rite, by ſprinkling or pouring on of Water novel, as I ſaid, or unjuſtifiable; for the word to Baptize uſually ſignifies as much, which

which as Dr. *Featly* x ſays *Heſychius*, *Stephanus*, *Scapula* and *Budæus*, thoſe great Maſters of the Greek Tongue, makes good by many Inſtances and Allegations out of *Claſſick* Writers.

x *Dipper dipt*, pag. 32. *See* Wells *alſo in his Anſwer to* Danvers, *pag.* 242. *Printed*, Anno 74. *and* Walker's *Diſcourſe of dipping and ſprinkling, wherein is ſhewn the lawfulneſs of other ways of Baptization beſides that of total Immerſion. Printed* Anno, 78.

And in this ſenſe is it uſed in Scripture. So the Fathers were baptized in the Clould, not dipt therein, for they were under the Cloud *, but were wet or ſprinkled therewith. So *Nebuchadnezzar*, was wet or ſprinkled, or ἐβάφη, as the *Septuag.* hath it, baptized with the Dew of Heaven. Hence we read of diverſe waſhings or Baptiſms, as the word is. And what were thoſe but ſprinklings? Sometimes Blood was ſprinkled †; ſometimes Water was poured forth; No Perſon was dipt or plunged in Blood; yet thoſe ſprinklings were called Baptiſms. So *Mark* 7. 4. except they waſh, the Original is, except they be baptized; and the manner of their waſhings before Meat, was not by dipping but by pouring on of Water ‖: We read alſo of waſhing or baptizing Tables * and other things many times a Day, which if done by dipping would make the labour of the Jews intolerable, beſides many other inconveniences. And 'tis but reaſonable that the outward Baptiſm ſhould have alluſion to and an Analogy with the inward. We are ſaid to be baptized with the Holy Ghoſt, but not dipt into the Holy Ghoſt or his Graces; but to be ſprinkled therewith, as with clean † Water (in our Baptiſm) and to have the

* 1 Cor. 10. 2.

† Hebr. 9. 10.

‖ 2 Kings 3. 11.

* Mark 7. 4. *in the Margin, beds.* vid *Lightfoot*, vol. 2. p. 345.

† Ezek. 36. 25.

* Iſaiah 44. 3. the Holy Spirit poured on us *. And it had been more properly tranſlated, baptized in Water, if it had been done only by dipping, rather than baptized with Water.

Again, if we take a Survey of the ſeveral Inſtances and Examples of Perſons baptized in Scripture, we ſhall find that 'twas probably done by ſprinkling, or pouring on of Water, rather than by dipping. St. *Paul* was baptized by *Ananias* when Sick and Weak, having faſted three Days and was not ſtrengthened till he received Meat, which was after he was baptized †, and according to all Circumſtances, it was done in his Lodgings. So when the Goaler and thoſe that belonged unto him were baptized, it was at a time and place, that there could be no accommodation for Water and other Conveniences for plunging and dipping, as the manner of ſome is; for 'tis not likely that the Apoſtle ſhould carry the Goaler, and all his in the dead of the Night to a River or Pond to Baptize them. 'Tis ſaid, *Phillip* and the Eunuch went down into the Water, or to ‖ the Water, but 'tis not ſaid after what manner he was baptized, and a Man may go down into the Water, and come up out of it too, and not be covered all over with it; if he wet but his Feet or Ankles, or wade but Knee deep, he goes down into the Water, and ſo may come up out of it, and our Lord and the Eunuch might do no more, and then have their Faces waſhed or ſprinkled only in Baptiſm; and if St. *Bernard* may be believed, this way was Chriſt baptized, and as for the Eunuch, if we'll believe St. *Jerome* * and Sir *Geo. Sandys*,

† Act. 9. 18, 19.

‖ Act. 8. 38. εἰς ὕ-δωρ.

* Serm. de St. *Joh.* B. p. 1303.

Sandys *, he could not be dipped, becauſe the Fountain in which he was baptized, (which retains the name of the *Æthiopian* Fountain to this Day) is immediately drunk up by the Earth out of which it Springs, and ſo not likely to be deep enough to dip the *Æthiopian* Treaſurer in it. Moreover who can ſay, that he ſtript himſelf, or that he was dipt in his wearing Cloaths, much leſs that he had any conveniency for ſhifting for ſuch a purpoſe; for the meeting we find was very accidental, and the Eunuch preſently, as ſoon as the ſolemnity was over, went on his way, nor do we read that he made any ſtay, but went immediately down from his Chariot to the Water.

Eſtius on *Act.* 2. 41. judgeth it moſt rational to conceive, that the Apoſtles did Baptize by waſhing or Sprinkling, for ſays he, 'tis altogether incredible, that they dipt 3000 in one Day, and 5000 at another time, and 'tis moſt likely that the 3000 were baptized in the ſame Place where they heard St. *Peter*'s Sermon which converted them; where 'tis not likely that ſuch quantities of Water, as *Bonavent.* notes || could be found to ſerve for the decent dipping of ſo many. Whereas to ſuppoſe, that after St. *Peter* had ended his Sermon, thoſe thouſands took a Progreſs out of the City in order to the celebration of that Ordinance; as if dipping and plunging the whole Body under Water, were ſo eſſential to Baptiſm, that it could not be rightly performed without it, don't ſo well agree with Chriſt's Commiſſion. For comparing *Matt.* 28. 19. with *Mark* 16. 15. the inſtruction or order that

* De locis Hebr. in voce Bethſ. *p.* 500. Trav. *l.* 3. *p.* 142. vid *Fullers* Miſcel. *l.* 2. *c.* 8. *p.* 220. Fons ad radices Montis ebulliens ab eadem in quâ gignitur ſorbetur humo & Apoſtolorum Acta referunt Eunuchum Candacis Reginæ in hoc Baptizatum fuiſſe. vid. Zanch. de cultu dei externo, *l.* 1. *col.* 494. Linwood, *l.* 3. de bapt. *and other learned Men.*

|| In *l.* 4. ſent. diſt 3. Artic. 3. q. 2.

that is given, is to this purpoſe; that preaching the Goſpel to all Nations, they ſhould Diſciple and Baptize them; not that they ſhould Preach in this or that Place, and then take them forth, that they may deſcend to ſome River to Baptize them; for to have the Ordinance of Baptiſm adminiſtred apart from the meeting Place of the Aſſembly, for all other Duties, would look ſomewhat like the Popiſh Pilgrimage, or at leaſt like their going a Proceſſioning, eſpecially in ſome Countries and Places, where there is not a River in many Miles compaſs.

I may further add, the conſideration of the danger of plunging and dipping over Head and Ears. Our Saviour, who prefers Mercy before Sacrifice, will have the adminiſtration of the Ordinace, in ſuch a way as is moſt conſiſtent with his Peoples lives; even of thoſe of the weakeſt Conſtitution; which muſt in ſome Countries, eſpecially at ſome Seaſons of the Year, be in extream danger by dipping.

And there is no diſpenſation in Scripture, for procaſtinating Baptiſm; yea in ſome ſhort proceſs of time, we find the Church expreſly againſt ſome Mens taking liberty of putting off their Baptiſm, and giving publick Teſtimony of her diſlike; inſomuch that theClinicks, if any of them recovered, were adjudged unworthy to be admitted into any Office of the Miniſtry, not only by the Council of *Neoceſaria* *, but by earlier Rules of more ancient Obſervation; which were urged by *Cornelius* † againſt *Novatus*, and as *Surius*

* Can. 12. Carahz. *giving this for a Reaſon*, non enim fides illius voluntaria ſed ex neceſſitate eſt.

† Apud Euſeb. *l.* 6. *c.* 33. prope finem.

rius remarketh *, the Ordination of ſuch Perſons to the Prieſthood was prohibited by thoſe Ancients, not for that they thought them not ſufficiently baptized, but becauſe they judged it unfit, that ever they ſhould be Prieſts, who deferred ſo long before they would declare themſelves to be Chriſtians. The truth is, notwithſtanding this Procaſtination of Baptiſm in *Novatus*, and tho' too he had upon his recovery, neglected to have the Confirmation of the Biſhop (according to the cuſtom of the Church) which *Cornelius* † accounts as another juſt exception againſt him, yet *Fabian* finding ſome relaxation allowable by Law upon ſome weighty Reaſons, did by his Mediation and importunity prevail to have him ordained, giving aſſurance that he would ordain no more ſuch; which could in no wiſe be granted him, if *Novatus*'s Baptiſm had been Null, and the manner of its Adminiſtration unlawful, which as *Cornelius* writes was by ſprinkling. An unanſwerable proof and inſtance, of adminiſtring Baptiſm, by way of ſprinkling ſo early in the Church, as in the time of *Novatus*, of whom the ſtory is, and who no doubt was not the firſt Man that was ſo baptized, ſeeing 'twas pleaded in Bar to admiſſion into Orders, as being againſt Law.

* Tom. 1. pag. 223. *declaring* Novatus's *Ordination to be* contra Canones.

† *In his Letter to* Fabian, apud Euſeb. Harm. E. *l.* 6. *c.* 43. vid. Niceph. *l.* 6. *c.* 3. Chemnit. Exam. *par.* 1. *p.* 84.

Mr. *Cradock* a great Independant, in his Treatiſe of Goſpel liberty, ſays, that the practice of dipping is to be reſtrained by the chief Magiſtrate, for the preſervation of the lives of his Subjects. And in the Senate of *Zurick* in *Switzerland* there was an Act made, that if an Anabaptiſt dipt any of their People, he

was to be puniſhed with drowning. St. *Cyprian* doth not only allow of pouring on of Water or ſprinkling in Baptiſm, but pleads for it in certain Caſes, and acquaints us, that 'twas uſual in thoſe Days to Baptize ſick Perſons in their Beds, and proves that ſuch Perſons were rightly baptized, tho' only ſprinkled from *Ezek.* 36. 25. and ſays, that ſprinkling, holds forth the Myſtery as well as dipping *. Upon this cuſtom of the Clinicks, the learned *Voſſius* makes this remark, that thoſe that were thus baptized were not plung'd or dipt under Water, but only ſprinkled.

* *See his Diſcourſe on Purpoſe, when the queſtion concerning it was put to him by one* Magnus. *Epiſt.* 76. ad Magnum.

But 'tis urged from *John* 3. 23. that *John* was baptizing in *Ænon* near *Salim*, becauſe there was much Water, a Reaſon given by the Holy Ghoſt himſelf, why he choſe that Place for the Country to come in, and be baptized, becauſe they might go many Miles in thoſe hot Countries, and not meet with a drop of Water, and it was a great Priviledge to thoſe Places that banked on *Jordan*, that they had much Water, but 'tis no Argument to prove that *John* plunged all that he baptized, or dipt them over Head and Ears. Beſide the Original is not πολὺ ὕδωρ, but πολλὰ ὕδατα many Waters, *viz.* Streams or Rivulets; and Hiſtory informs us, that they were ſo ſhallow as not to reach above the Ankles and ſo unapt for dipping as their way is †. The Eunuch, as has it hath been well obſerved, doth not ſay here is a River, here is a Pool, here is Water enough for me to be dipt into; the quantity of the Water is not inſiſted on; which fairly in-

† Non intereſt quanto quiſque abluatur, quomodo in Euchariſtia non quantum quiſque comedat. Chamier. *l.* 5. de bapt. *c.* 1. *p.* 1404.

intimates to us, that where there is Water, be it much or little, nothing hinders but one may be baptized therewith. I had need now to crave Pardon, for being ſo very Prolix on this Head, but I hope St. *Auſtin*'s * Apology in the like Caſe, may paſs for mine : *Tanto magis pro Infantibus loqui debemus, quanto minus, pro ſe loqui poſſunt.*

* Ad Hilar. Epiſt. 89.

THE REPLY

To a pretended

ANSWER

To the foregoing Diſcourſe.

IT will not be unneceſſary to premiſe, that this foregoing Diſcourſe in oppoſition to the Anabaptiſts, contained at firſt only eleven Pages in cloſe writing, a Copy of which was tranſcribed and communicated to a particular Friend; who ſhortly after upon their confident Boaſting, that they would get it anſwered, did by my Permiſſion, deliver it into their Hands, from whom after almoſt a Years time, and through frequent importunities; I received an Anſwer in Manuſcript, ſuch as it is, conſiſting of 27 Pages. I think it needful alſo to premiſe, that I have ſomewhat inlarged my Diſcourſe, but not ſo as to cauſe the leaſt difference in my enſuing Reply, nor ſhall I make the leaſt advantage upon any Improvement or Addition I have made, nor is there in truth any occaſion for it. For I do ſolemnly, and with all ſincerity proteſt, that I don't find I had need to have had any word, Syllable, or Letter ad-

ded, left out, or altered in my Papers, by reaſon of any thing in the pretended Anſwer.

My Argument in ſhort is this: That as Circumciſion was the initiating Sign and Token of the Covenant to the Jews: So is Baptiſm to the Chriſtians, and that the Command to keep the Covenant in the Sign of it, whatever the Sign be, was and is always Obligatory; and that the practice from Age to Age anſwers it.

In the Proſecution whereof I obviated many Objections, now made uſe of by the Anſwerer (which takes up above half of the aforeſaid 11 Pages) whereto there is no manner of Reply, ſave only ſomewhat about the Sabbath or Lord's Day, but not to the purpoſe, as will afterwards appear; and at that rate too, that he dares not condemn the *Sabbatarians*. This with the Preface takes up 3 Pages of the Anſwer. Nevertheleſs that he may ſeem to ſay ſomewhat he turns Opponent.

Firſt, He endeavours to prove, that the Covenant, whereof Circumciſion was the ſign, was not the Covenant of Grace, as having relation only to temporal Promiſes, taking a Branch for the whole; and reckoning that God made two diſtinct Covenants with *Abraham*. And this takes up 2 Pages more.

Secondly, He labours to prove that Circumciſion can give no ground for Infant Baptiſm, nor bear a ſuitable Parallel with it; uſing Arguments which have been anſwered over and over, and in a great Part obviated by me, tho' he takes no notice of it. This reacheth to his 10th Page.

Then

Then he takes notice of my citing *Act.* 2. 39. running out into a large Ramble, which will not bear any Teſt; and as introductory thereto, he begins thus: You ſay the Promiſe in the 39. *v.* is ſpoken to thoſe in the 36. *v.* even the Houſe of *Iſrael*, who had crucified the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and their Children; of which I had not ſaid a word. And adds, that by Children he doth not underſtand them as they are in a ſtate of Infancy. But how doth he illuſtrate it? Why very profoundly and unanſwearably with five or ſix Arguments, which to give them their full force, amounts to this: That there were none ſuch then preſent, as he takes for granted; neither could any of them be Children to whom St. *Peter* Preached, and ſaid, *Repent and be baptized every one of you.* For were this true, would it follow as he would ſillily infer; that St. *Peter* neither did nor could ſpeak of or concerning Children to them? May it not then be as well argued, that the Promiſe did not belong to thoſe afar off, that ſhould hereafter be called? Unleſs we underſtand thereby ſuch of them as were then preſent, and had been St. *Peter*'s Auditors? Which would be a contradiction *in terminis.* Now this, with ſome groſs impertinence and ſenſeleſs Stuff which immediately follows, comes home to the 14th Page of the Reply. So that there is above half of mine, and within a few Lines half of his paſt over, and hitherto it cannot be pretented there is any kind of Anſwer.

As to what follows, he ſays himſelf, Pag. 15. that what is written in my 8, 9, 10, 11 Pages, (and I don't remember there were

any more in the Tranſcript-Copy they had) concerning the Covenant and Infants right to Baptiſm, he ſuppoſeth to be anſwered in what he had written aforegoing. He means, he had framed Arguments, which was not his Province. Moreover in theſe Pages he omits ſeveral Things, which muſt needs be reckoned very material, whereto he anſwers nothing. I'll inſtance in ſome particulars.

Firſt, That in Chriſt's Dialect, to belong to him, and to be his Diſciple: Is all one.

Secondly, That Infants are called Diſciples by the Holy Ghoſt.

Thirdly, That they are made ſo by God himſelf, vouchſafing graciouſly in their believing Parents to accept them alſo into his Covenant, and ſo into the ſtate of Diſciples.

Fourthly, That the Apoſtle ſhews that intereſt in the Promiſe, is alone of it ſelf a ſufficient ground for the application of Baptiſm.

Fifthly, That the Suffrages and Authorities of the Primitive Fathers are on our ſide, which he overlooks as inſignificant, tho' they are only produced to ſhew what was their judgment in the Caſe, and the practice in their time.

Sixthly, That ſprinkling or pouring on of Water, doth as well expreſs the Myſtery as dipping, and better alludes to the inward Baptiſm of the Spirit.

And that 'tis very improbable that the 3000 baptized in one Day, and in all likelihood where they heard St. *Peter*'s Sermon, were dipped.

Again

Again he neither denies, nor vindicates their concurrence with the Papiſts, tho' I had repreſented it in ſo many Inſtances; and whereas I ſaid expreſly, that the Fathers in avouching Infant-Baptiſm to be an Apoſtolical Tradition, did not underſtand the word Tradition in the Popiſh ſenſe, to ſupply the ſuppoſed defect of the Scripture. Yet he poſitively affirms it is to be believed to do ſo, and ſo he runs on for above 2 Pages, proving the Perfection of the Scripture, that is fighting with his own Shadow, for who denied it?

Once more I ſaid, we don't read in the New Teſtament of laying on of Hands on any unbaptized Perſon, except in order to a bodily Cure. But the Anſwerer, paſſeth by the exception, and then doubtleſs he confuted his Adverſary, ſpeaking ſo home to the matter. What hath been hitherto obſerved, chiefly refers to the Method and Compoſure of the Anſwer, and diſcovers in it ſo much of weakneſs and inſufficiency, that no judicious Perſon can well allow it that denomination. But taking liberty further to diſplay its imbecility, I ſhall offer ſomewhat by way of Reply, to the matter and contents of the pretended Anſwer, that (if poſſible) I may provoke him or ſome one for him to make a Rejoynder, that the point in Controverſie may be thorowly ſifted, and the truth cleared, or left to the World to judge how unable that Party is to maintain their way, or make any tolerable defence.

He ſaith, Page the firſt, that he cannot underſtand that the weight of the Arguments for Infant-ſprinkling, but rather thinks that the

the want of weight in them, is the Cauſe an Anſwer hath been ſo long neglected. It ſeems he is unfit to anſwer Arguments tho' they want weight, and others perhaps may think it was very meet and fit he ſhould have let them alone, rather than prejudice his Cauſe by an unfit Anſwer, and ſhould not have put himſelf upon this Tryal of his Skill, unleſs he could have managed it better. But firſt an Anſwer as he ſaith is expected, that is ſomething muſt be done towards the giving an Anſwer, for the amuſing the expecting People, who otherwiſe ('tis likely) would have been more apt to have miſtruſted the weakneſs of their Cauſe. Secondly, 'Tis preſumed that after the peruſal of my Diſcourſe, by ſome of the more learned and wiſer Heads, 'twas thought more eligible to leave it to one that is unfit for it, to give an Anſwer; that the defect thereof may not reflect on any of the *Grandees*, or rather 'tis ſuſpected that ſome Chief undertook it, but under the mask of one unfit, that the lameneſs of the Anſwer, (of which the Preface ſeems conſcious) may by thoſe that peruſe it, be imputed to the Author; and the ſtrength thereof, which their own Party will ſuppoſe, may be aſcribed to the preſumed goodneſs of the Cauſe they have eſpouſed, however tho' he be unfit he will make an Eſſay. Yea he will (which is more) give an Anſwer to ſuch things as he thinks may have any thing in them that calls for an Anſwer.

Now he who will diſcharge the Office of a Reſpondent, ought fairly to repeat his Adverſaries Words, and then to apply his Anſwer, either by denying or diſtinguiſhing, or both;

both; but how this hath been obſerved by the Anſwerer, you will ſee in the firſt Paragraph.

The firſt thing, ſaith he, that I take notice of is in Page 1. where you endeavour to prove that Infant-Baptiſm came in the room of Circumciſion, although no poſitive Preſcript for it, bringing the change of the Sabbath-Day from the ſeventh to the firſt, without preſcript.

Reply, Theſe are ſo far from being my words, that they contain not the ſenſe of them. For (1.) neither I, nor I think any Body elſe ever indeavoured to prove, either that Baptiſm came in the room of Circumciſion, without a poſitive preſcript, or that Infant-Baptiſm came in the room of Circumciſion, but that Baptiſm did, which none can juſtly deny. St. *Paul*, Coloſſ. 2. 12. affirms as much, *viz.* That Baptiſm in the New Teſtament ſucceeded Circumciſion, the initiating Sacrament of the Old Teſtament, and that as plainly, as in 1 *Cor.* 5. 7, 8. he hath affirmed the Lords Supper to come in the room of the Paſſover; for the Apoſtle having told his *Coloſſians*, that they had the Circumciſion made without Hands, the Circumciſion of the Heart; he further ſignifies by way of implication, that they had as good as the outward Circumciſion too, by being baptized, or he could have no occaſion to add, [*being buried with him in Baptiſm*] and his Argument had been nothing at all, a mere *non ſequitur*, unleſs he gives them to underſtand thereby, that Baptiſm ſucceeded and came in place of Circumciſion. To evidence this to be the genuine ſenſe and intention of the Apoſtle; know that he was here

here diſſwading the believing Chriſtians from the Rudiments of the World and Jewiſh Ceremonies, particularly from Circumciſion, upon this very ground, that they were compleat in Chriſt; but leſt the Jewiſh Teachers ſhould ſuggeſt, that the receiving the inward Grace of Circumciſion, doth not make them ſo compleat as the Jews were, becauſe they had alſo an outward viſible ſign. As *Abraham*, for inſtance, had the inward Grace, and yet he received the outward Sign; and conſequently, tho' Chriſtians be made partakers of this great Benefit by Chriſt, yet they may ſtand in need of an outward Seal, to aſſure them of their partaking herein; he would have them know that neither is this Priviledge wanting to Chriſtians, who have as excellent and expreſs a Sacrament of it; and that Chriſt hath not left his People under the New Teſtament deſtitute of ſuch an outward Sign and Seal; for however Circumciſion be taken away, yet there is another Sacrament ſubſtituted and appointed, a more excellent and lively one than ever Circumciſion was, a Sacrament reſembling it, and anſwering to it [*buried with him in Baptiſm*; *wherein*, &c.] that is ſacramentally ſignifying and ſealing up both our mortification and our vivification. But if they had eſpouſed Antipedo-Baptiſm, they might have urged their diſſatisfaction, and have again Replyed, that tho' they needed not to be circumciſed themſelves, ſeeing Baptiſm is ſo happily come in the room of it, yet they would ſtill Circumciſe their Children, becauſe according to their Doctrine, Baptiſm is not to be applyed to them.

In

In the ſecond Place, the Words have no poſitive Preſcript for it, and without a Preſcript, do ſhew either that he did not underſtand my Argument, (tho' eaſie to be underſtood) or elſe that he wilfully altered and perverted my ſenſe, that he might ſerve ſome other Deſign, than the finding out the Truth, His own Conſcience muſt tell him, he hath fathered on me what I ſaid not. This Addition of his, *without Preſcript*, inſinuates as if I had there argued, that the want of a Precept for the change from Circumciſion to Baptiſm, is no more a reaſon to deny Baptiſm to Infants, than the want of a Precept for the change from the ſeventh Day to the firſt, is a reaſon for the rejecting of the Lord's Day. That the Anſwerer did thus intend to repreſent me, ſeems plain; becauſe after he had ſhewed Reaſons for the firſt Day, he concludes, ſo we have a plain Precedent, tho' not poſitive Preſcript for the firſt Day, but you want not only Precept but Precedent for Infant Baptiſm. [Page 3.] Now the obvious meaning of my Diſcourſe there, is, that the general Command of keeping God's Covenant in its Sign, as alſo the general Command of obſerving the Day of the Sabbath, one Day in ſeven is obligatory to Chriſtians, as well as it was to *Abraham* and his Seed. The conſideration what is the particular Sign, or whether it be altered from what was firſt ſpecified; or whether with or without a Preſcript, being not there any part of the Argument; its main ſtrength depending on the general and primary Part of the Precepts; the ſubſtance therefore of what I ſaid is, that the general and primary Command to *Abraham*,

ham, (thou and thy ſeed ſhall keep my Covenant in the ſign of it) is of perpetual Obligation; as in the fourth Commandment, the general and primary Command for ſanctifying the Sabbath, or keeping Holy one Day in ſeven, obligeth now as well as then; and that if Chriſtians be diſcharged from obſerving Circumciſion as the Sign, and the laſt of ſeven, which was appointed to be the Sabbath at firſt, (which are ſecondary poſitive Commands,) yet they are bound to obſerve a ſeventh Day, and to keep God's Covenant in its Sign, (theſe things being of Primary obligation.) And now what is ſaid to all this? Why truly as to the general Command to *Abraham* above mentioned, he paſſeth it over at leaſt for the preſent, and ſays nothing about it, but as to the Sabbath, doth he deny that the general Commaud of keeping one Day in ſeven Holy continues obligatory? Not at all; which he ſhould have done, if he would have oppoſed the force of my Argument. What doth he then do? Why he gravely ſays, (1.) He knows no poſitive Command for the change of the ſeventh Day to the firſt. (2.) He knows one Day of ſeven was commanded. (3.) He gives ſome account what we have to ſay for the change of the ſeventh Day to the firſt. *Laſtly*, That he dares not blame the *Sabbatarians*. By all this he confirms my Argument; and that too more than it required. And yet he hath ſo mannaged the matter, blind-folding his ignorant followers, that thoſe who heard only his Papers when they were read apart in their Congregation, doubtleſs thought that he anſwered what may be reaſonably thought to call for an Anſwer.

He proceeds, (Page 3.) to obſerve concerning the Covenant, which he ſaith, I have written ſeveral Pages about, ſuppoſing that as *Abraham*'s natural Seed were in Covenant, and had right to Circumciſion, ſo the Seed of Believers are in Covenant, and ought to be baptized.

Reply, The word Natural is not in the Text; neither was it put in by me: 'Tis rather their way to add to the Word, the better to gloſs over their Error. Provided nevertheleſs, it be not underſtood *qua tale*, as natural, I do admit it, and own the whole; it being that which I have fully demonſtrated. But ſo it is to be accounted for my Concluſion, rather than for my Hypotheſis. However it be, he makes two exceptions againſt it; tho' it be very illogical to nibble as it were at the Concluſion, whilſt he tacitly grants the premiſes. But it muſt be conſidered, that he hath ingeniouſly acknowledged how unmeet and unfit he is to be a Reſpondent; and he doth but go on to prove it.

The firſt Exception that he makes is: That the Covenant in the 17 of *Gen.* is not a Covenant of Grace: This indeed would overthrow the very foundation of my Diſcourſe, could it be proved, and duly applied. Neiof which, tho' he Acts here the Part of an Opponent, is done by the pretended Anſwerer; whereof he is ſo Conſcious, that he dares not depend upon it, fearing he ſhould be driven to his Shifts, ſhould we put the matter in Controverſie to this iſſue. And therefore that he may have a Loop-hole to eſcape, he ſaith (Page 8.) neither indeed were it that Covenant, meaning the Covenant of Grace, would

would it as to that help you: And he is not without a pretended Reaſon, to help himſelf in it; becauſe forſooth Grace doth not go, ſays he, in Generation from Parent to Child. Wiſely argued! 'tis as much as to ſay, ſpeaking to the Point, God is not a God to *Abraham* and his Seed too, his Promiſe in that reſpect went beyond his Performance. Grace cannot go by Covenant from Parent to Child. And who are thoſe that found deſcent of Grace in natural Generation, or ſay that Believers Children are in this gracious ſtate, becauſe they are believers Children, that is by vertue of natural Generation. We only ſay, 'tis by vertue of the Covenant, the Promiſe that is made to the faithful and their Seed; whereupon are grounded ſuch gracious Priviledges and Perogatives deſcending from Parent to Child. So that the Root being Holy, the Branches are ſo too *, yea if but one of the Parents be a Believer †, the Children are in a Holy Separate-State; not common and unclean with the reſt of the World; but in ſuch a State at leaſt, as puts them into a more advantagious and fairer Proſpect of Heaven, and greater probability of obtaining ſaving Grace, than if they had been out of the Covenant, that Holy State, ſo as the Promiſe did not reach them. Hence Chriſt ſpeaking of the Jews Collectively, calls them the Children of the Kingdom ||, the Apoſtle the Children of the Covenant *, the Margin referring it to that of *Gen.* 12. 3. which himſelf ſaith, (Page 5.) reſpects the Covenant of Grace.

* Rom. 11. 16.
† 1 Cor. 7. 14.
|| Matt. 8. 12.
* Act. 3. 25.

But to Reply to his Exception, as he goes on to demonſtrate it here, as his manner is,

 he

he Acts the Opponent rather than the Reſpondent, and therefore thinks himſelf not concern'd to meddle with the Arguments produced by me, tho' he pretended otherwiſe in his Preface, and ſeemed to Promiſe to give Anſwer to ſuch things as call for an Anſwer, but ſince 'tis not his mind, I am content to anſwer his Allegations; and moreover do purpoſe to take occaſion from thence, further to demonſtrate the Identity of the Abrahamical and Evangelical Covenant, that the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. is a Covenant of Grace; the more firmly to eſtabliſh the Scripture Foundation touching God's Covenant with *Abraham*, on which, as himſelf ſays truly, (Page 3.) I found the ſtreſs of my Diſcourſe.

He ſays, (Page 4.) that he looks upon this Covenant, in the 17th of *Gen.* not to be the Covenant of Grace, but a Covenant God made with *Abraham*, reſpecting ſome temporal Bleſſings that God was pleaſed to beſtow upon him, and his natural Seed, and the ſame with, *Deut.* 29. 1. and onward to the 9th but adds, that he underſtands the Covenant in *Gen.* 12. 3. and 18. 18. to have a reſpect to the Covenant of Grace. Now ſuppoſe the Land of *Canaan* be the main matter Promiſed to *Abraham* in the ſaid Covenant, it may not follow, that 'tis only a temporal Bleſſing; becauſe under temporal Promiſes, Spiritual Bleſſings were veild and conſigned, by a temporal Poſſeſſion of the promiſed Land, an eternal Inheritance in the heavenly *Canaan*, was aſſured to them. Beſides you take a part for the whole, that which is but an Adjunct, or an appendix, for an entire Covenant; as

if God made two diſtinct Covenants with *Abraham*, when as there is not the leaſt hint for it in the whole Bible, which ſpeaks only of one Covenant made with that Holy Patriarch, even that which Circumciſion did conſign, which was a Spiritual Covenant under a Veil, but now 'tis one and the ſame without a Veil, as Doctor *Taylor*, who is ſo often quoted by them, expreſſeth it *, and ſo could not re-

* *Diſcourſe of Baptiſm.* p. 37.

ſpect only, as the Anſwerer ſaith, God's bleſſing him with a numerous Iſſue, and them with the Land of *Canaan*; there being in that no ſenſible Bleſſing to *Abraham*, ſeeing neither he nor his Poſterity enjoyed the Promiſe as a mere earthly Bleſſing for near 500 Years after, doubtleſs therefore this muſt be made good to him, as before premiſed, or there was a Bleſſing for him, which was concealed under the leaves of a temporal Promiſe. Beſides there were others than *Abraham*'s Seed, and *Iſmael* who were to be circumciſed †,

† Gen. 17. 11, 12.

to whom the Land of *Canaan* did not belong.

The Myſteriouſneſs of this Tranſaction, we are further inſtructed in by St. *Paul*, Heb. 11. 13. *They all dyed in the faith, having not received the Promiſes*, as he obſerves, *viz.* of a Temporal Poſſeſſion in *Canaan*. They ſaw the Promiſes, that is the Spiritual Part, afar off: they embraced them, and looked through the Cloud and temporal Veil, and deſired a better Country, that is an heavenly; or the ſame in an heavenly State. This was the Object of their deſires, and the ſecret of their Promiſe: And therefore Circumciſion was a Seal of the Righteouſneſs of the Faith, which

he

he had before *, and ſo muſt relate principally to an Effect and Bleſſing greater than the generality of the Jews apprehended, or was expreſt in the ſurface of the Temporal Promiſe. Wherefore when God promiſed pardon and forgivneſs of Sins, he promiſed to remember this Covenant †, what ſtay could it be to *Moſes*'s Faith, when God appeared to him in the Buſh, in ſaying I am the God of thy Fathers of *Abraham*, &c.‖, if it only concern'd temporals. *Agnoſcatur*, ſays *Chamier* *; let it be granted that the Promiſe of the Land of *Canaan*, together with the Multiplication of *Abraham*'s Poſterity is annexed to this Covenant, yet ſays he, this is not the Covenant but an appendage to it, as to Godlineſs the promiſes of this Life are annexed, Earthly things were indeed under that diſpenſation promiſed more fully and diſtinctly; ſuitable to the Jewiſh Pedagogical Eſtate, to allure them to the ſervice of God; and heavenly things more generally and ſparingly: On the contrary, ſpiritual Bleſſings are more fully and clearly, and earthly Things more generally and ſparingly held forth, and promiſed to us under the Goſpel Adminiſtration: And the Land of *Canaan* was more particularly inſiſted on in the firſt Diſpenſation; being deſign'd for the Type of Heaven, and an explanation of the Primary grand Promiſe to be their God: Denoting, that he would as certainly bring them to the Celeſtial *Canaan*, and to the ſpiritual and glorious Reſt there; as to that temporal and corporeal Reſt from their ſervitude and captivity in *Egypt*. Hence it was that *Jacob* gave ſuch a ſolemn Charge to *Joſeph*, and *Joſeph* to his Brethren, the

* Rom. 4. 11.

† Levit. 26. 42.

‖ Exod. 3. 6.

* *Lib.* 5. de bapt.

one to Bury his dead Body in *Canaan*, the other for the Tranſportation of his Bones thither, which they would never have done for an earthly Inheritance, but to nouriſh in the Hearts of their Poſterity Faith and Deſire of reſt in Heaven, in the Communion of Saints, whereof *Canaan*'s reſt was a Type, into which, not *Moſes* the Law-giver, but *Joſhua* or Jeſus the Type of Chriſt was to bring them. So that the whole Tenour of the *Abrahamical* Covenant, ſpeaks it a Covenant of Grace; and the Apoſtle giving us the ſubſtance of it in the Goſpel, doth it in theſe Words *, *I will be to them a God, and they ſhall be my People.*

* Heb. 8. 10.

But ſuch is this Man's Confidence, that he prays me to take notice, whether there be any thing elſe in the 17th of *Gen.* but temporal Bleſſings. But what ſaith he to *v.* 4. as the Apoſtle applies it, *Rom.* 4. 27. whereto 'tis referred in the Margin? Or to *v.* 7. denoting the quality of the Covenant, that 'tis not temporary but everlaſting, reſpecting ſpiritual good Things? Or to the following Words: To *be a God to thee and thy ſeed after thee? Bellarmine* indeed ſays, that God when he enjoyned Circumciſion to *Abraham*, did Promiſe only earthly Things, *i. e.* the Propagation of his Poſterity and the Land of *Paleſtine*, as this Anſwerer doth; and again, *I will be a God to thee and thy ſeed*, holds forth, ſays *Bellarmine*, only a Promiſe of a peculiar protection. But *Ameſius* well obſerves, in his Anſwer to him, that our Saviour gathered from thence a Reſurrection to Bliſs; or his Argument againſt the *Sadducees* † had not been Concluſive.

† Matt. 22. 32.

In

In ſhort this Covenant is ſo much the Covenant of Grace, that it contains in it the great Myſtery of Man's Redemption, as is plain from the Comment of *Zachary* upon it *, the belief whereof was the juſtification of *Abraham* †, wherefore 'tis expreſly ſaid, that when God enacted this Covenant with *Abraham*, he preached the Goſpel unto him ‖, that is, he made a Covenant with him, concerning Chriſt and Salvation by him; and he ſaith further, that it was preached to the Jews as it is to us *.

* Luke 1. 71.
† Gen. 15. 5, 6. Rom. 4. 3.
‖ Gal. 3. 8.
* Heb. 4. 2.

Thus we ſee, what that Covenant with *Abraham* was, that 'tis ſubſtantially the ſame that we are now under, or by what means elſe did any of the Jews before Chriſt came, obtain Grace or Glory? It was before Chriſt's coming into the Fleſh cloathed with many Shadows of now aboliſhed Ceremonies, Types and Sacrifices, in its Adminiſtration, having upon Mount *Sinai* the Covenant of works adjoyned to it, or the firſt Covenant; ſo termed, for that in the ſubſtance thereof it repreſented the firſt Covenant. So that by Reaſon of theſe adjuncts, 'tis ſometimes diſtinguiſhed from its very ſelf, as it was adminiſtred by Chriſt after his Incarnation. But if not the ſame, how are the Gentiles ſaid to be grafted in amongſt them †, as *Grotius* hath it, or according to *Beza* and *Piſcator*, *pro ipſis* inſtead of them, or in their Place; or how doth the ſame Olive-Tree continue ſtill? It remains then, that there are not two Covenants of Grace, differing in ſubſtance, but one and the ſame under various Adminiſtrations.

† Rom. 11. 17.

* Theſ. 7. *Camero* * makes three Covenants, one of Nature, one of Grace, and one ſubſervient to that of Grace. But *ubi unum propter aliud, ibi unum tantum:* But leſt I be thought too general in my Procedure, I ſhall further demonſtrate that God's Covenant with *Abraham*, conſiſts of thoſe very ſubſtantial Parts which are aſſigned to the Evangelical, as 'tis in this 17th of *Gen.* and elſewhere more fully expreſſed by *Moſes*, interpreted by the Prophets, and applyed by the Apoſtles.

In *Gen.* 17. 1. he tells *Abraham* what a God he will be unto him, *viz.* A God all-ſufficient. Which Promiſe you have *Gen.* 15. 1. divided into two Parts; and in other Places among the Prophets, into theſe Three; firſt, All-ſufficient to pardon the Penitent; ſecondly, To give his Holy Spirit; thirdly, To give eternal Life. In each of theſe reſpects, was God lookt upon as all-ſufficient in the Old Teſtament. In *Iſaiah* 55. 7. God ſays, *I will forgive and multiply my pardons.* Hence the Jews are exhorted to repent †, for that the Promiſe of the Pardon of Sins by the Blood of Chriſt belongs to them, and he promiſeth further to put his Spirit within them; and to cauſe them to walk in his Statutes ‖, and as 'tis in *Deut.** to Circumciſe the Heart. So *Zachary*, ſpeaking of God's Covenant, and his Oath to *Abraham* †, makes mention of this two-fold Mercy, which accrues to us by vertue thereof, *viz.* Firſt, Deliverance from the Power of our Enemies, Sin and Satan. Secondly, Grace and Strength to ſerve him, that he would *grant*, or as the Word is rendered ‖ *give Power*, to wit his Grace and Holy Spirit, for the amending of our Lives.

† Act. 2. 39. Ezek. 36. 25.

‖ Ezek. 36 27.

* 30. 6.

† Luke 1. 71, 74.

‖ Rev. 11, 3.

See

See alſo *Pſal.* 103. 3. and *Eſa.* 44. 3. And that theſe Places refer to God's Covenant with *Abraham*, is yet more evident from *Gal.* 3. 16. where the Promiſe of the Spirit is called the bleſſing of *Abraham*. And tho' the Promiſe of eternal Life is not any where in the Old Teſtament plainly expreſſed, yet it was concealed under the leaves of a temporal Promiſe, wherein all the Prophets do unanimouſly declare, there was an excellency of Bleſſing, far exceeding what Believers outwardly enjoyed in their Peace, Proſperity, Kingdom and Temple-Worſhip, which could be no other than the ſpiritual and eternal Deliverance of their Perſons from Sin and its curſe, with the enjoyment of the Favour of God here, and eternal Life in the World to come, as 'tis obſerved by St. *Paul* in the eleventh Chapter to the *Hebrews*. In like manner the Condition on *Abraham*'s Part, is the ſame that is required of us Chriſtians, *i. e.* to obſerve the Evangelical Precepts; to believe and obey that Goſpel which was preached to him; as much as to ſay Faith and Obedience. Not that Righteouſneſs which is of the Law, exact legal Obedience, but that which is of Faith, that which is truly Evangelical; as is evident by comparing *Deut.* 3. 11. with *Rom.* 10. 6. and of the ſame nature with that of a Chriſtian. How otherwiſe could *Abraham* be the Father of them that believe, and his Faith the pattern of Faith to others, and we be admoniſhed to walk in the ſteps of his Faith, and to do his works?

Neither do the Preſcript Rules, given to the one or the other, make any alteration therein, ſo long as they are all of the ſame

Nature and Kind. Now that they are ſo, appears from the fore-quoted Places; where 'tis ſaid, that the Commandment is *not hid*, in the Hebrew and Septuagint not *too heavy*; but as Chriſt's Yoak and Burthen light and eaſie. Neither is it in Heaven or beyond the Seas, it will coſt no great Pains to come to the knowing and practiſing of it, very agreeable and conſentaneous to every one's Nature, very nigh and in the Heart, very eaſie to Learn and Practiſe; and what this is, is punctually ſet down *, to be *confeſſing of Chriſt*, and a Cordial belief of his Reſurrection, ſhewn forth in the Practiſe of thoſe Rules that he hath left us, and God had before Preſcribed.

*Rom. 10. 9.

And for that Commandment which Chriſt calls New, 'twas from the beginning, but being buryed as it were in a Law of Ceremonies, it ſeemed wholly laid aſide and neglected, inſomuch that few attained to ſo right a meaning of the Commandment, as that Scribe †, who our Saviour ſaith, was not far from the Kingdom of Heaven.

†Matt. 12.

But ſuppoſe the Divine Precepts are found to vary in number and perſpicuity, or the like, in reſpect of *Abraham* and us, yet that puts no diſtinction betwixt his Faith and Obedience and ours; for ſo the Faith and Obedience of one Chriſtian would not be the ſame with that of another, when in different Circumſtances. We conclude therefore, that *Abraham*'s Faith and ſo his Obedience is of the ſame Nature with ours. Accordingly runs the Precept, *Gen.* 17. 1. *Walk before me and be thou perfect*, that is *upright* or *ſincere* as the Margin ſhews; which implies that tho'

tho' he ſhould be ſubject to infirmities, yet ſo long as he hath a ſingle upright Heart, there is no more required than ſuch an Evangelical Obedience, the Righteouſneſs of Faith. Hence the Apoſtle diſcourſing of juſtification by Faith *, inſtanceth in *Abraham*, and argues that we are juſtified on the ſame Terms with him; and that neither Jews nor Chriſtians are otherwiſe juſtified than he was, who was juſtified or accounted Righteous, not only for that particular Act of Faith by which he believed that he ſhould have a Son which ſhould be his immediate Heir †, but that habit, that Grace of Faith, (that is chiefly and primarily) whereby he was able to believe that Promiſe with the ſame Faith he believed the Promiſe of the *Meſſiah*, that a certain Seed ſhould be given to him, *In whom all the Nations of the Earth ſhall be bleſſed.* And 'tis the ſame Faith to believe that God would ſend ſuch a *Meſſiah* before the Law, as that he hath exhibited and ſent him ſince; and conſequently what is now required of us, as the Condition of the Covenant on our part is the ſame, and no more in effect than what was required by God of *Abraham*, as the Condition on his Part. Foraſmuch then as hath been ſhewn, that God's Covenant with *Abraham* hath the ſame mercies on God's Part made over to Man; and the ſame Conditions, on Man's Part required of God with thoſe of the New Covenant, the *Abrahamical* Covenant cannot be denied to be the Covenant of Grace, and ſo my Foundation ſtands ſure and unſhaken, and beyond all doubt will ſo remain, notwithſtanding the utmoſt efforts of ſuch Aſſailants.

* Gal. 3. v. 5.

† Gen. 15. 6.

His

His other exception toucheth Circumciſion: Which, he ſays, to repeat his very words, can give no grounds for Infant Baptiſm, nor bear ſuitable Parallel with it. And thereupon he gives ſeveral Inſtances wherein they differ. But what would he infer hence? That the one ſucceeds not the other. And ſo there can be no *Argumentum à pari.* That therefore Infants ſhould be baptized; becauſe ſuch were circumciſed. I anſwer, the Lord's Supper ſucceeded the Paſſover; and yet they differ in many Punctilio's and Circumſtances: It ſufficeth to make the Parallel ſuitable, that Baptiſm is a Sacrament of initiation into the Covenant of Grace, and the Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith under the Goſpel, as Circumciſion was before under the Law, and doth as properly and effectually confirm and eſtabliſh the Covenant betwixt God and us now, as Circumciſion did then; Baptiſm being the only ordinary way of adding to the Church in the time of the Goſpel, on which ſcore 'twas inſtituted. And 'tis as requiſite that we ſhould in ſome ſuch manner ſeal to the Covenant now as *Abraham* before, we being as much unable to give an anſwerable aſſurance to Almighty God for our ſelves and Children, as ever *Abraham* was for himſelf and Poſterity; or if you will, may it not be thought as highly neceſſary that we ſhould be by ſome Rite matriculated members of the Chriſtian, as they were ſolemnly initiated into the Jewiſh Church? Now what other way is preſcribed to us of Matriculation, than Baptiſm; the only moſt proper Rite for this purpoſe, as it hath been in all Ages accounted; inſomuch that all the ſeveral Baptiſms that were before

Gen. 17. 11. Act. 7. 8. Rom. 4. 11. *compared with* 1 Cor. 12. 13. 1 Pet. 3. 21.

fore Chriſt, were all meant for initiating forms. So the Jews had a Cuſtom long before the coming of Chriſt, to make proſelytes or converts to their Religion, not only by Circumciſion but by baptizing, or waſhing them with Water. The ſame was the meaning of *John*'s Baptiſm to make Men Diſciples under his Adminiſtration. And the ſame was the meaning of Chriſt's Baptiſm, to initiate Men into the Chriſtian Religion, and make them Diſciples of Chriſt. Hence baptizing and making Diſciples, means the ſame thing, *John* 4. 1. *John* made and baptized more Diſciples, that is baptized them Diſciples, which was the form of making them ſuch. All the inſtances of Baptiſm in the New Teſtament were uſed as initiating Forms; and to no other Purpoſe, being therefore never repeated; no more than men were twice circumciſed or admitted into the Church before Chriſt. Nor do we find ſince the coming in of the Goſpel, any other Rite or Ceremony of initiation permitted, much leſs enjoyn'd. Sure I am, there was at firſt no framing of diſtinct Covenants for each Congregation, according to the fancy and humour of the reſpective Teacher, a mode which ſome of our late upſtart Sects have boldly introduced without any Divine Authority, or Foundation in the Word of God. And as there is no mention in the Goſpel of any Covenant, but one, of Grace, ſo neither of any other Sign or Token thereof, or any other form of entering into the ſaid Covenant, than Baptiſm; but as Circumciſion was heretofore, ſo Baptiſm is now the initiating Rite.

But

His other exception toucheth Circumciſion: Which, he ſays, to repeat his very words, can give no grounds for Infant Baptiſm, nor bear ſuitable Parallel with it. And thereupon he gives ſeveral Inſtances wherein they differ. But what would he infer hence? That the one ſucceeds not the other. And ſo there can be no *Argumentum à pari*. That therefore Infants ſhould be baptized; becauſe ſuch were circumciſed. I anſwer, the Lord's Supper ſucceeded the Paſſover; and yet they differ in many Punctilio's and Circumſtances: It ſufficeth to make the Parallel ſuitable, that Baptiſm is a Sacrament of initiation into the Covenant of Grace, and the Seal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith under the Goſpel, as Circumciſion was before under the Law, and doth as properly and effectually confirm and eſtabliſh the Covenant betwixt God and us now, as Circumciſion did then; Baptiſm being the only ordinary way of adding to the Church in the time of the Goſpel, on which ſcore 'twas inſtituted. And 'tis as requiſite that we ſhould in ſome ſuch manner ſeal to the Covenant now as *Abraham* before, we being as much unable to give an anſwerable aſſurance to Almighty God for our ſelves and Children, as ever *Abraham* was for himſelf and Poſterity; or if you will, may it not be thought as highly neceſſary that we ſhould be by ſome Rite matriculated members of the Chriſtian, as they were ſolemnly initiated into the Jewiſh Church? Now what other way is preſcribed to us of Matriculation, than Baptiſm; the only moſt proper Rite for this purpoſe, as it hath been in all Ages accounted; inſomuch that all the ſeveral Baptiſms that were before

Gen. 17. 11. Act. 7. 8. Rom. 4. 11. *compared with* 1 Cor. 12. 13. 1 Pet. 3. 21.

fore Chriſt, were all meant for initiating forms. So the Jews had a Cuſtom long before the coming of Chriſt, to make proſelytes or converts to their Religion, not only by Circumciſion but by baptizing, or waſhing them with Water. The ſame was the meaning of *John*'s Baptiſm to make Men Diſciples under his Adminiſtration. And the ſame was the meaning of Chriſt's Baptiſm, to initiate Men into the Chriſtian Religion, and make them Diſciples of Chriſt. Hence baptizing and making Diſciples, means the ſame thing, *John* 4. 1. *John* made and baptized more Diſciples, that is baptized them Diſciples, which was the form of making them ſuch. All the inſtances of Baptiſm in the New Teſtament were uſed as initiating Forms; and to no other Purpoſe, being therefore never repeated; no more than men were twice circumciſed or admitted into the Church before Chriſt. Nor do we find ſince the coming in of the Goſpel, any other Rite or Ceremony of initiation permitted, much leſs enjoyn'd. Sure I am, there was at firſt no framing of diſtinct Covenants for each Congregation, according to the fancy and humour of the reſpective Teacher, a mode which ſome of our late upſtart Sects have boldly introduced without any Divine Authority, or Foundation in the Word of God. And as there is no mention in the Goſpel of any Covenant, but one, of Grace, ſo neither of any other Sign or Token thereof, or any other form of entering into the ſaid Covenant, than Baptiſm; but as Circumciſion was heretofore, ſo Baptiſm is now the initiating Rite.

But

But to Reply to his Inſtances, whereby he would prove the Parallel not ſuitable: His firſt Inſtance or Reaſon is, becauſe the natural Seed of *Abraham*, without any token of a work of Grace on them, ought to be circumciſed; but the natural Seed of Believers, without ſome token of a work of Grace upon them, ought not to be baptized. For which he cites *Matt.* 3. 6. to *v.* 10. That ſome had a ſenſe of their Sins, and were brought to a confeſſion is plain, *v.* 6. But what token was there of a work of Grace on them, whom the Baptiſt calls there a Generation of Vipers? And yet of them he ſays, *I indeed Baptize you.* And St. *Mark* ſays, *they were all baptized of him*; he refuſed none of them. So that they were only the Phariſees and Lawyers, that were not baptized of him, who exempted themſelves. Or what token of a work of Grace appeared on thoſe that were baptized of *Lydia*'s Houſhold; beſides what was obſerved on her ſelf? And yet not ſhe only was baptized, but her Houſhold upon her Converſion. And if others of the Houſe were thereupon baptized, much rather her Infant-Children, if ſhe had any ſuch. This is certain, ſhe had a Houſhold, a Family, and they were baptized as well as her ſelf. To alledge that ſome had ſuch a work of God wrought upon their Souls, before they were baptized, proves nothing; for ſo doubtleſs had ſome Jews, and *Abraham* in particular, before they were circumciſed. That interrogative, *Mat.* 3. 7. having there the force of a Negation, implies that they had no manner of Conviction, nor could any have taught them, that they ſhould merely by St. *John*'s Baptiſm avoid

Matt. 3. 7. *v.* 11. Mark. 1. 5. Luke 7. 30. Act. 16. 15. Domûs autem nomine ipſam intelligimus familiam; imprimis vero Liberos & nepotes, *ſays* Marl. *on the Place. See Monſ.* le Clerc's, *Supplement to Dr.* Hammond *on the Place.*

void the deſtruction that hung over their Heads, and therefore he bids them to repent. He muſt prove, if he can, that none elſe ought to be baptized; for as yet we have only his bare *Ipſe dixit*, his own ſay ſo, he may paſs for a Magiſterial Dictator to his own ignorant Party, who can follow him with an implicit Faith; but his Authority will not ſway with any others of ſober ſenſe.

(2.) He ſays the natural Seed of *Abraham* were commanded to be circumciſed, but the Children of Believers are no where, in the word of God, commanded to be baptized. This is that we call a begging of the queſtion. Is not Baptiſm as expreſly commanded now, as Circumciſion was then? But Infant Baptiſm he will ſay is not. Neither need there to be a new or diſtinct Command for it: Becauſe their right to be within the Church or Covenant, together with their Parents, is not a new Inſtitution; but as old as *Adam*, for ought I know, ſays Dr. *Wallis* *; but the ſolemn Rite of admiſſion into this Church, (to which the Children of Believers have a right to be admitted) is a new Inſtitution. Then by Circumciſion appointed to *Abraham*: And Now by Baptiſm upon a new Inſtitution, appointed by Chriſt, as the ſame Author expreſſeth it.

* *Defence of Infant Baptiſm*, pag. 14. Printed *Anno* 97.

Another Reaſon that he gives (which is the only one more that I need conſider here) is, becauſe there is a ſore Puniſhment threaten'd on the Man-Child that is not circumciſed †, but no Puniſhment threaten'd in the whole Word of God, on an Infant for not being baptized. Anſwer, This Argument, were it

† Gen. 17. 14.

of

of any force, doth militate againſt the Lord's
* Exod. 31. 14. Day ſucceeding the Sabbath *, which nevertheleſs he himſelf hath granted, and in ſome meaſure made good. Moreover the Puniſhment threaten'd, doth not affect Infants wanting Circumciſion, but Perſons neglecting or contemning that Ordinance. The words in the Original import no more, *Præputiatus Mas*, the uncircumciſed Male, (ſo *Junius* conceives the word to be there taken, with reference only to the Sex, not to the Age) ſhall be cut off, not in his Infancy, but afterwards when he comes to Years of Diſcretion; if then he approves his Fathers or Guardians neglect, and neglect Circumciſion himſelf. Which *Junius* makes good by two Arguments: Firſt, From the Original which may be rendred as well, and rather actively than paſſively, according to the different *Radix* it may be derived from, thus, *who ſhall not circumciſe his fore-skin.* Secondly, From the Reaſon that God himſelf there gives; *for he hath broken my Covenant.* Which is not incident unto Children, and therefore the threaten'd Puniſhment was very unlikely to be inflicted on them, who could not commit the Offence: We read that *Moſes* was in danger of being ſlain by the Angel, for neglecting
† Exod. 4. 24. to circumciſe his Son †, but nothing is ſaid of the exciſion of his Son, but that afterwards he was circumciſed though the eighth Day was paſt.

I have already obſerved in the beginning of this Reply, how abſurdly he has gone about to prove, that by Children, in *Act.* 2. 39. are not meant Children as they are in a ſtate of Infancy, making no difference between the

the Perſons the Apoſtle ſpoke to, and thoſe he ſpoke of, but implying that all thoſe whom the Apoſtle aſſerted to have an intereſt in the Promiſe, muſt neceſſarily be only the very ſame Perſons he was diſcourſing to, and therefore the Children, as the Anſwerer explains himſelf, muſt be ſuch as ſhould be able to imbrace the precept to repent. A Concluſion that can in no wiſe follow from his premiſes, and 'tis impoſſible it ſhould from any other, ſince it would argue the Apoſtle himſelf to be guilty of vain tautology and impertinence, if no more were meant of their Children than of all the World. Beſides there was no occaſion for naming Children at all, but the ſenſe had been as full without it. But this Anſwerer, not contenting himſelf with ſuch abſurd Arguing, as I have already noted, begets here a ſuperfetation of abſurdities, and further to ſhew his excellent faculty of *quidlibet ex quolibet*, cloſeth as it were every Paragraph of this long Ramble, of almoſt three Pages with this fancy'd Inference: *So from this, Infants ought not to be baptized*, repeating it no leſs than ſix times, without hardly varying one Word; not weighing how 'tis reduced, or brought in Head and Shoulders, ſo long as it may ſerve any way to amuſe that poor ignorant miſguided Sect. There is a parcel more of the like impertinent Stuff, for almoſt a Page and half immediately following; which ſeeing it don't ſo nearly touch the main matter in controverſie, that I may not be too tedious, I will paſs over in ſilence, though he has deſerved other Returns for his groundleſs Cenſures and Upbraidings,

braidings, which he is forced to make uſe of for want of Reaſon.

In the next Words, Page 14. he brings me in ſaying, ſo that excluding Children from the Covenant, and debarring them of the Sign, puts a ſacrilegious reſtraint thereon, and excludes them from the ordinary way of Salvation. Whereto he returns this Anſwer, You put more ſtreſs upon it, than it will bear; but what doth he mean by that? Doth he deny the Propoſition? That it doth not put a ſacrilegious reſtraint upon the Covenant? No ſuch thing. Or doth he deny the Conſequence that it excludes them from the ordinary way of Salvation? Not at all. What then! Doth he inſtance in any ordinary means, whereof they are capable? Not ſo neither. He mentions that of *Rom.* 10. 14, 15. but himſelf hath obſerved, Page 11. that that goes beyond their capacity to make uſe of. And 'tis yet he ſays to prove that Baptiſm is an Ordinance of Chriſt for Infants. What then? Why he even makes the matter of no conſequence at all, whether there be allowed them any ordinary means or no; tho' at the ſame time they allow them to have original Sin. There is then, according to him, no ordinary way left for the Salvation of Children. For as he intimates, in the beginning of this Page, a believers Child hath no Priviledge more then the unbelievers to any Ordinance of Chriſt: But how contrary is this Doctrine to that of our Saviour *Mark* 10. 14? Where he ſays, *of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*; which ſignifies their having an intereſt in Heaven hereafter, and conſequently muſt imply their capacity of being of the viſible

Church

Church here. And it muſt be primarily meant of Children, and not ſuch only as are humble and innocent like them; otherwiſe the ſenſe cannot be coherent: For what is the innocency and humility of ſuch to Children, that they ſhould be ſuffered more than Lambs, or the like humble and innocent Creatures to be brought to Chriſt, to be received into his Arms? Who might better have been propounded, as patterns of more perfect Innocency, having no original Guilt; unleſs Chriſt had meant to be thus underſtood, *Bring little Children to me, for to them, and ſuch as are like them, belongs the Kingdom of Heaven* *.

* Talium dicit non horum, quia comprehendit tam puellos quam eorum ſimiles, *ſaith* Muſculus, hac ergo voce Chriſtus parvulos & horum ſimiles ad ſe pertinere teſtatur. *So* Calvin *giving for a Reaſon, which St.* Mark *and St.* Luke *add, verily I ſay unto you, whoſoever ſhall not receive the Kingdom of God, as a little Child*, &c. inſulſe enim, *as* Marlor. *ſets down further*. Anabap. pueros excludunt à quibus initium fieri debebat. *And elſewhere*, piorum liberos dicimus Eccleſiæ filios naſci & ab utero reputari in Chriſti membris, quia hac lege deus nos adoptat ut ſit etiam ſeminis noſtri pater.

Again what ground of comfort can ſuch as he give to their Parents, in caſe of their Death, that they ſorrow not as Men without hope? Seeing they don't appear to ſuch to belong to Chriſt. And if withal they have no means to bring them to Chriſt, they may well be thought to be in a deſperate Eſtate, while in their Infancy. Certainly it hath been lookt upon as a great advantage, to be in God's ordinary way of Salvation. In the time of the Jews, before and under the Law, 'twas a great preference to be of the number of God's People, members of the viſible Church, Branches of the Olive-Tree; and is

it not now as great a Priviledge and Advantage to be in a like Covenant-relation, grafted into the ſame Olive-Tree? Or can it be reaſonably ſuppoſed that God would ſo often, and ſo emphatically make Promiſes to the Righteous and their Seed, to be a God to them and theirs, if there was not ſomewhat of peculier preference intended them beyond thoſe of the Wicked, or thoſe that are out of God's viſible Church? But if no more be intended, but upon condition of Faith and Repentance; this is equally true of the Children of the moſt profligate, and of Heathens, as of Jews and Chriſtians: And Chriſt's coming muſt have rendred the condition of Children worſe than before. Whatever then be the Priviledges of being within the Pale, and the Promiſe of the viſible Church, they muſt belong to the Children of Believers now, as they did to the Seed of *Abraham* heretofore: By being ſuch, they have *jus ad rem*, a right thereunto; and by being baptized, they have *jus in re*, and are as it were put into the poſſeſſion of the ſame. So that denying them Baptiſm, we do as much as lies in us debar them of the outward means, the enjoyment of the Priviledgeof being in the Church, and the benefits thereunto appertaining.

Should a like Queſtion be put concerning a baptized Chriſtian, a member of Chriſt's Church, with that which the Apoſtle propoſeth, *Rom.* 3. 1. touching a circumciſed Jew, *What advantage*—— the Anſwer may be the ſame with his. *v.*2. *Much every way*: And in *Rom.* 9. 4, 5. are reckoned up no fewer then eight Priviledges or Prerogatives belonging to a Jew upon the ſcore of that Relation.

lation. The ſame advantage that there was then to the Jews, (as God's viſible Church) is now common to the Gentiles alſo; and if Children were ſharers therein with their Parents, during the former Adminiſtration, how are they excluded now? Thoſe Children more particularly, whoſe Parents kept their Station *; and if ſome Children continued within, becauſe their Parents ſo continued; what hinders but others ſhould be admitted, whoſe Parents are re-inſtated, or have gained a like Priviledge with thoſe that are?

* Rom. 11. 5, 17.

The Prophet *Eliſha* wept when he looked upon *Hazael*; becauſe he foreſaw he would daſh the Infants of *Iſrael* againſt the Wall; and even *Hazael* thought himſelf worthy to be eſteemed a Dog, if ever he ſhould do ſuch a thing. But certainly to daſh all the Infant Children of Believers out of the Covenant of Grace (as much as in them lies) and to deprive them of the Seal of it, is in a ſpiritual Senſe far more heavy; and I dare appeal to the tender Bowels of any believing Parents, whether it were not eaſier for them to think that their Children ſhould be daſhed againſt the Stones, and yet in the mean time to die under Chriſt's Wing, as viſible members of his Kingdom; rather than to have them live, and behold them to have a viſible ſtanding only in the Kingdom of the Devil. We read of *Herod* the Tyrant, that he deſtroyed all the Children in *Bethlehem* and the Coaſts thereof, from two Years old and under: But is it not a far more cruel ſentence, to ſet theſe in no better ſtate than Pagans and Infidels, without Chriſt, Aliens from the Com-

mon-wealth of *Iſrael*, ſtrangers from the Covenant of Promiſe, having no hope, and without God in the World? How far Heaven extends its mercy to thoſe that are without means, and cannot uſe them, is a Myſtery hid from us, and known only unto God. 'Tis our Happineſs, that he hath not left us deſtitute of the ordinary means of Salvation, with reſpect to our Children as well as to our ſelves; and therefore whatſoever means of Grace God has appointed, as Inſtrumental to that end that they are capable of, are to be afforded them; unleſs God hath made any particular exception in the Caſe. And Baptiſm being appointed by God as ſuch a means, we cannot well Adminiſter it too early to our Children; for tho' it doth not confer Grace, *ex opere operato*, yet it always doth ſo, when God is pleaſed to vouchſafe the concurrence and co-operation of his Holy Spirit with it. And we know not how ſoon the operation may be, how ſoon God may by his Grace pre-diſpoſe their Souls to an aptneſs for good through the means; it may be long before they are in a capacity to Act any, and therefore the Ordinance ought by no means to be withheld from them or neglected.

Pag. 16. He queſtions what a Diſciple is, whether he be not a Scholar or one taught, and whether Infants can be ſaid to be Diſciples, till they are taught? To this I Anſwer, That a Diſciple in the New Teſtament is the ſame with Chriſtian *, any one that hath a Relation unto Chriſt, and ſo of as large an extent as the word *Iſrael* in the Old Teſtament. Infants therefore having a Relation unto Chriſt are of his Body, not Heathens but

* Act. 11. 26.

but Chriſtians, and ſo conſequently Diſciples *infieri*; not for that they are actually taught of God, but becauſe they are, as I may ſay, retainers to Chriſt, and deſigned for his School; into which when they are admitted or initiated by Baptiſm, they are more compleatly Diſciples, Diſciples in *facto eſſe*, having then not only a right to, but are inveſted with the Priviledges of thoſe that are properly and actually Scholars or Diſciples, not as being perſonally inſtructed, but as conſecrated and ſet apart for the ſervice of Heaven; placed ſo, as to be reckoned Scholars of Chriſt, being entered into his School, tho' they be no Proficients. And thus, they are commonly reputed of the number of the Scholars or Diſciples, who are admitted into a School, and only entered there to learn, tho' they have not learnt a Leſſon or a Letter. As *John* the Baptiſt baptized to Repentance, or in order to it. Who ſhould limit God? May not he make Diſciples ſeveral Ways? By the Adminiſtration of the Ordinance of Baptiſm, and ſo by putting on them his Livery; or by teaching them by his Spirit from the greateſt to the leaſt; by writing his Laws in their Hearts; or by graciouſly accepting them into his Covenant with their Parents; or bringing them under a Religious Government?

Page 18. He would know, whether I can tell *Lydia* was a Maid, Wife, or Widow, or whether there were any Infants in her Houſe? I anſwer, 'Tis plain ſhe had a Family, and that upon her Faith alone they were brought into God's ordinary way of Salvation, and

* Act. 16. 15. were forthwith baptized *; unleſs they'l underſtand by her Houſe the Stone-Walls.

By Salvation coming to *Zacheus*'s Houſe, he underſtands (Page 19.) the *Meſſiah*. Anſwer, Chriſt would have rather ſaid I am the *Meſſiah*, which had been true, whether *Zacheus* was the Son of *Abraham* or no, and ſo there had been no occaſion of giving that Reaſon, that the Covenant of *Abraham* reached him: But why doth he ſo perverſely underſtand by Salvation, the Perſon only of the *Meſſiah*, but purpoſely to avoid the Argument; which yet is no other but what the whole Current of the Scripture holds forth, *viz.* That the bleſſing of *Abraham* immediately deſcends to an Houſe or Family, upon the Converſion of the Head or Chief thereof. But none are more blind than they that will not ſee.

In the forementioned 18 and 19 Pages, he endeavours to render it probable, there were no Infants in the Houſholds I had inſtanced in; but there is enough ſaid in theſe inſtances, that the bleſſing of *Abraham*, viz. Salvation, came to an Houſe, eſpecially to the Children, if any ſuch there were, upon the Faith or Converſion of the Chief; that 'twas uſual for the whole Family thereupon to be put into the ordinary way of Salvation, added to the Church to be ſaved; and eſpecially Children that have not committed actual Sins, nor could reject the Counſel of God againſt themſelves. Whereas there might have been perchance ſome others in the Families, who with thoſe Phariſees and Lawyers might have ſo done, and ſo have rendred themſelves unworthy

worthy of the bleſſing; but this could not have been incident unto the Children.

The ſtreſs then of the buſineſs lies not in this: Whether it can be proved there were Infants in thoſe Families, where 'tis recorded whole Houſholds were baptized; but the truth of the Caſe is this, That in all Families whatſoever, were there never ſo many Infants they were all baptized, when their Parents were baptized. Which ſhews the vanity of this repeated ſaying, Not one word of an Infant in this Houſe, Not one word of Infants in all thoſe Houſholds, and the like.

Now to retort this their negative Argument upon themſelves, let it be demanded, where they find mention in Scripture of any Children of Chriſtian Covenanting-Parents that were baptized, when they came to Years of Diſcretion, and not before. That they were baptized I ſuppoſe they'l not deny; and if ſo, let them ſhew where and when, for this let all the ſacred Regiſter be ſearched, from the time that *John* the Baptiſt began his Miniſtry, to the time that *John* the Evangeliſt ended his, (which was above 60 Years, during which time thouſands, if not millions of Children of ſuch Parents were grown up to Maturity) and if in all that time they can but ſhew any one Inſtance of any Child ſo priviledged, whoſe Baptiſm was deferred till he came to Years of Diſcretion, and that then he was baptized, it may then be acknowledged, that there is ſome ſtrength in their Negative Allegations. In the mean time having ſuch general Inſtances of baptizing whole Families, ſurely we have more reaſon to believe that Infants were comprehended, and

are to be reckoned in the number, than they have for the contrary. I ſaid we read of none laid aſide or excluded Baptiſm upon the Account of their Non-Age. To this he anſwers, Page 20. We never read in the whole Word of God, that ever any Infant was commanded or offered to be baptized, and if ſo, how ſhould we read of any laid aſide or excluded, that were Non-ſenſe. But I ſay again, Is there any Direction given in the Goſpel to lay them aſide, in caſe they be offered to Baptiſm? And who can ſay they were not offered? Where then is the Non-ſenſe? Can it be imagined, but that the Jews brought their Children with them to the Baptiſt, to ſave them as well as themſelves from the wrath to come, who were ſo tender of their Children, and ſo zealous for their Circumciſion, they who had been always uſed to have their Infants admitted into the ſame Covenant with themſelves, by vertue of a Divine Law, would have raiſed great Arguments againſt the Divine Authority of Chriſt, if he or his Diſciples in his Name, had refuſed to admit their Children together with themſelves into this Covenant, of which they taught God's *Meſſiah* to be the Mediatour. So that 'tis no Non-ſenſe, to ſuppoſe that we ſhould have heard in the Goſpel of Children being excluded, if they had not been of courſe admitted. I ask therefore again, ſhew us in any place of Scripture, where any one was excluded Baptiſm upon the account of Non-age, particularly ſuch a one whoſe Parents were admitted thereto; for if in that ſacred Book, ſuch are not expreſly excluded, we are to take it for granted, they are not to be excluded

cluded at all ; ſince it hath been God's conſtant Method to take Children into his Covenant, when he took in the Parents. Thus for inſtance, the Covenant made with innocent *Adam* included his Infant Children. The Covenant made with *Abraham* (which hath been already proved to be the Goſpel Covenant) included his Children. So the legal Covenant of which *Moſes* was Mediatour, included the Jewiſh Infants alſo : Therefore they ſhould ſhew us, where God hath altered this Method in the Goſpel ; or elſe we are to take it *pro confeſſo*, that God hath not altered this his conſtant Method. And the *Abrahamical* Covenant which included Infants (ſeeing it could not be diſanull'd by the legal Covenant) continued till Chriſt unrepealed. If therefore they can't ſhew, that 'tis repealed by Chriſt, we are to conclude that 'tis not repealed at all. Gal. 3. 17.

Wherefore our negative Argument is more cogent from Scripture, for Infants being in Covenant with their Parents, and that they have a right thereupon to Baptiſm, than theirs is againſt it, and proceeds on the faireſt and moſt credible Grounds. As firſt, That there were Children in ſome at leaſt of thoſe Houſholds that are ſaid to be baptized upon the Converſion of the Chief of the Family. Secondly, That if the Jewiſh Converts Infants had been forbidden Baptiſm, they would have made ſuch a noiſe about it, that the ſacred Hiſtory of thoſe times muſt needs have taken notice of it. And laſtly, It having been God's conſtant Method, when ever he made a Covenant before Chriſt came, to include the Infants in it, and particularly God having by

an

an expreſs Law commanded Infants to be admitted to the ſign and ſeal of the Goſpel *Abrahamical* Covenant, it muſt be ſuppoſed that God, if he had intended to exclude Infants from the ſign and ſeal of the Goſpel-Covenant under Chriſt, would have ſignified his Pleaſure, that his former Method of dealing with Infants was altered, or that the aforeſaid Law in the Covenant with *Abraham* was as to Infants repealed. Whereas the Anti-pædo-Baptiſts negative Argument proceeds upon all the contrary improbable Grounds, and therefore their objecting, that we have no certain inſtance of the Baptiſm of any ſuch, and that we don't read that ever they were offered to be baptized, is of no force; for it ſhall be preſumed by vertue of that Law which is unrepealed, *viz.* That Children ſhould keep the Covenant in the ſign of it, that they were both offered and admitted of Courſe. How highly had the Jews been ſcandalized, if the firſt Planters of Chriſtianity had denyed an admiſſion of Infants into the Covenant under the Goſpel deſpenſation, when they had ever been allowed it under the Moſaick œconomy, and had wholly ſhut them out like the Children of Infidels? This muſt in all probability have galled them, to ſee their Infants ſo treated, to have had no viſible difference put between the Infants of thoſe that embraced, and thoſe that reſiſted the Faith, having always reckoned upon Pagans Children as common and unclean, but their own as ſeparate and holy. St. *Paul* makes the ſame diſtinction, that tho' but one of the Parents be a Believer, yet they are ſo far ſanctified each to other, that their Children are thereby entitled

to

to the Covenant of Grace, which they had not been, if both the Parents had been unbelievers. Had St. *Paul* taught a contrary Doctrine, or any other of the Apoſtles, *viz.* That the Children of Chriſtian Parents had no more right to Baptiſmal Initiation, than thoſe of Heathen Idolaters, it would certainly have offended them more than all they preached againſt Circumciſion, and keeping the Ceremonial Law.

Page the 17. He hath theſe Words: The nearer you are to the Truth, the further off you are from the Papiſts, and the further off from the Truth the nearer to them. Which is ſo falſe, that 'tis not in the leaſt deſerving a confutation; ſince they hold moſt, if not all the fundamental Articles of Faith, how e're they may endanger the Foundation by their building Hay and Stubble thereon. But it ſignifies nothing it ſeems, to retort upon them for ſymbolizing with the Papiſts, tho' in points diametrically oppoſite to the Proteſtant Religion; it don't affect them, as he gives us to underſtand in the Words juſt before; neither will they be concern'd to take notice of any ſuch charge. At this rate they themſelves may fall into the groſſeſt Principles of Popery, and yet be nearer the Truth, and it muſt paſs for ſound Proteſtant Doctrine. And no reflection muſt be made, as if they had a Prerogative peculiar to their Sect, that whatſoever opinion they eſpouſe (they are ſo infallible in their Tenets) though it be never ſo Erroneous and Popiſh, it immediately commenceth Orthodox.

To my ſaying and proving that Antiquity is on our ſide; inſtead of anſwering the Au-

Authorities, he ſays, Page 23. that 'tis my great Miſtake, and wonders how I could aſſert ſuch a thing; ſince they can go back as far as *John*, and Chriſt, and his Apoſtles. Now I muſt and do acknowledge, that no Argument or Antiquity is equal to the Scriptures, when the Interpretations are not doubtful; yet when they are ſo, I appeal to any ſober Diſſenter of whatſoever Sect or Party, whether the harmonious Practice of the ancient Churches, and the undivided conſent of Apoſtolical Fathers, be not the moſt ſure and authentick Interpreters that can be betwixt Men and Men; they thought Infant Baptiſm lawful and valid, and no abuſe of the Ordinance of Baptiſm. And let any modeſt or moderate Man judge whether it be likely that thoſe famous Saints and Martyrs, ſo near the Apoſtles times, ſhould fall into ſuch a deluſion, as as to conſpire in the Doctrine and practice of a Mock-Baptiſm, and of making multitudes of ſuppoſititious Chriſtians and Churches? Or whether it be not more probable, that a little Sect, repugnant to all the Ancient as well as modern Churches, ſhould be in an Error. The very Scriptures, whoſe ſufficiency we admire as well as they, cannot be proved to be the Word of God without Tradition; and though they are ſufficient, where they are underſtood, to determine any Controverſie; yet the right Underſtanding and Interpretation of them in many Points, the practice of the Church is as requiſite, as the practice of the Court is to underſtand the Book of the Law.

I may further obſerve to them, that they themſelves cannot defend, according to their own

own *Poſtulatum*, the baptizing of ſuch grown Perſons, as were born and bred in the Church, from the Scripture; for that the very Inſtitution there, of Baptiſm, hath a ſpecial regard to *Proſelytes*, who from *Judaiſme* or *Gentiliſme* were coming over to the Chriſtian Faith. Neither can they produce a Precedent of ſuch an one baptized in the New Teſtament, but all the baptized Perſons we read of in it, were Jews or Gentiles of an expiring or falſe Religion newly converted; and therefore according to their own demands, if to juſtifie their own practice, they muſt produce ſuch a particular Diſtinct Precept or Example; they cannot defend themſelves againſt the Quakers, who for this and other Reaſons have quite laid aſide Baptiſm; nor againſt the opinion of the *Socinians*, who uſe this very way of Argumentation for the Non-neceſſity of Water-Baptiſm. Though they think good in their preſent Circumſtances to practiſe it *.

* Vid. *Johannis Volkelii*, Miſnici de verâ Religione *Lib.* 6. *Cap.* 14. de Aqua-Baptiſmo ab Apoſtolis Uſurpato, *pag.* 663.

In the ſame Page he ſaith, 'tis ſtrange reaſoning to Argue, that 'twas not likely that St. *Paul* was dipt when he was baptized, ſeeing he was Sick and Weak, having faſted three Days, *&c.* Methinks he ſhould rather have ſaid ſtrong reaſoning, being it would be ſo unſuitable to the eaſineſs of Chriſt's Yoak; who will have Mercy and not Sacrifice. Ay, but ſaith this Anſwerer, he being commanded to be baptized, cloſed with the Command; and did not conſult with Fleſh and Blood. Very good, it would ill become him to diſpute God's Commandment, but was the manner preſcribed? That it muſt be by dipping

ping the whole Body under Water, or plunging it as they do with their Cloaths on, which would be rather a baptizing of Garments than of Bodies; nothing of this appears. All Circumſtances agree, that he was not ſo baptized: Such a penance to St. *Paul* in his Condition, had perhaps been more Unſupportable than Circumciſion, and more dangerous than whatever the Ceremonial Law required; to thoſe therefore who are ſuch ſtubborn Aſſertors of the Doctrine of dipping, that of St. *Peter* may be well applyed: Why tempt ye God to put ſuch a Yoak on the Necks of Chriſtians, that are not able to bear it? And let them fear who ſubmit thereto, that God ſay not unto them at laſt, who hath required this at your Hands?

What he ſaith to the Inſtance of the Goaler, is in ſhort this: If they had not gone forth out of his Houſe, how could he ſay, when he had brought them into his Houſe? As if the Keeper had not, or might not have an Apartment in the Priſon peculiar to himſelf, and diſtinct from that of the Malefactors?

He is again with my ſtrange reaſoning, Page 24. about the manner of *Philip*'s baptizing of the Eunuch. It ſeems 'twas too difficult for him to Anſwer to any purpoſe; and therefore he bids me to leave off ſuch Carnal Reaſonings. But what doth he ſeem to ſay to it, he endeavours to ſhew that *Philip* and the Eunuch's meeting could not be accidental, as I had obſerved, for this very Reaſon: Becauſe it was eminently Providential, which argues that he is ſo very Simple and Ignorant, that he underſtands not what accidental Means, or

that

that he moſt erroneouſly thinks that ſome things may happen or fall out without the Divine Preſcience, and in which the Providence of God is not concern'd. He hath a mere Figment of his own Invention, though he don't apply it, which would argue, that their Meeting was not altogether accidental, but that *Philip* at leaſt had ſome previous Knowledge thereof; for he ſays, *Act.* 8. 26. The Angel of the Lord bids him, *ariſe and go to meet him*: When as there is no ſuch thing in the Text. And therefore he may juſtly fear, leſt that Curſe he more than once cauſeleſly alludes to Page 22. as of ſo tremendous and dangerous a Conſequence, ſhould light upon himſelf, for having ſo palpably and ſo groſly added to the Word, and to the belying of the Angel, making him ſay what he did not.

But he ſaith 'tis hard for him to believe, that I really think that they were baptized ſo by ſprinkling, though I ſo write, and appeals to me, whether the word Baptize doth not ſignifie to dip or plunge and not to Sprinkle? I have ſhewn that the Word ſignifies not only to dip, but to waſh or pour on Water, or to Sprinkle, and is often ſo uſed in Scripture; and gave inſtances of which he takes no notice. Chriſt no where requires dipping but baptizing. And as to the method or manner how it ſhould be done, the Scripture is ſilent; nor can there be an Example produced abſolutely for dipping: I believe that ſome were baptized in Scripture, by pouring on of Water, or by Sprinkling; others by dipping: But I queſtion, whether after the manner of our Anabaptiſts. We

don't

don't deny dipping as in it ſelf unlawful, as they do pouring on of Water, or Sprinkling; but we ſay, the practice is Schiſmatical when done in oppoſition, and dangerous in ſuch a cold Climate, and in ſome ſeaſons of the Year. And when too the Party is of a weak and ſickly Conſtitution: And troubled with Catarrhs, Conſumptions, and the like.

Page the 26. He pleads for dipping from the ſignificancy of the Ceremony, referring to *Coloſ.* 2. 12. I do not in the leaſt deny, but that it ſeems to follow from thence, that there was ſuch a Cuſtom in thoſe Days as to Baptize by immerſion, which carryed a very ſenſible ſhew of a Burial and a Reſurrection, but the Negative cannot be thence concluded, that there was no other way of baptizing but that, nor is it probable there was no other way; becauſe there are other Texts of Scripture, which allude to ſprinkling in Baptiſm, as this doth to dipping: And the like Collection muſt be allowed to be made from the one, that is made from the other, and farther, becauſe there may be and is a Baptiſmal repreſentation made of a Burial, and of a Reſurrection in aſperſion and affuſion of Water, as well as in dipping *. He that hath Water poured on him as well as he that is dipt, is put under Water: And the Water falling on him that is ſprinkled, fairly repreſents the Earth falling upon him that is Buried, and ſpeaks the ſimilitude of a Burial. And by the one as well as by the other, we may be ſaid to

* Voſſius *cites ſeveral Authors, who deny any ſuch Repreſentation to be required, the thing being as they ſay but accidental and not eſſential to Baptiſm, and in caſe there ought to be at leaſt ſome ſimilitude of that Nature, this he tells us, is expreſt in* aſperſione, etiam vel perfuſione, quia cujus caput, *as he adds*, aſpergitur vel perfunditur, is aquis iſtis quaſi ſepelitur. Theſes Theologicæ, *pag.* 360.

to be buried with Christ by Baptism into Death. The Representation then is made both ways, tho' in the one 'tis more lively and sensible than in the other; and the appearing again after, and from under that affusion, represents also a Resurrection; so that the Symbol is not spoiled here. Accordingly in the Provincial Council of *Colen* *, sprinkling as well as dipping is indifferently spoken of, as expressive of a Type of Christ's three Days Burial, and our conformity to him in that and his Resurrection. Moreover Christ's bodily Actions and Passions must be imitated and represented by us after a spiritual way; and 'tis a vain thing to imagine, that every Metaphorical Expression used in the Scripture, signifying our Communion with Christ and conformity to him, should punctually express the Mystery in the Sacrament, both as to the Letter and Spirit. The Metaphorical Expressions are various: Putting him on, buried with him, sprinkling with his Blood. And what hinders but that the Symbolical Ceremonies and the Sacramental Signs may be so too, or at least variously used, or accompanied with various circumstantial Ceremonies? One Sign after one, and the same way administred, cannot express our Communion with Christ and our conformity to him in his Death and Resurrrection, as to all the foregoing Metaphors. Our Communion with Christ in his Death and Resurrection, and our conformity to him therein is the sacramental Grace, and that being represented as well by sprinkling or pouring on of Water, as by dipping; it follows, that Water in either way of application is Sacramental. A-

* Sub Hermanno Celebrato, *Anno* 1530.

gain, our waſhing and cleanſing from Sin by the Blood of Chriſt, and the raiſing up our Souls to a ſpiritual Life, being the principal effects of Chriſt's Death and Reſurrection repreſented and ſealed in the Sacrament, is truly ſet out as hath been ſhewed by ſprinkling as well as by dipping. Hence under the Law the ſacrificial cleanſing was done by ſprinkling in ſome Caſes, and by dipping in others *, and the purifying by Chriſt's Blood is equally repreſented by both, called therefore the Blood of ſprinkling, and ſprinkling of Blood †.

* Numb. 19. 18,19. Heb. 9. 13.

† Heb. 12. 24. 1 Pet. 1. 2.

In his Concluſion, not to ſpare me, but to tell me my own, he reminds me of his old *Item*, formerly given, that we have neither Precept nor Example for Infant-Baptiſm. So ſay the Papiſts as well as the Anabaptiſts, tho' in other Words: That 'tis a mere Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, no Divine Apoſtolical Ordinance. In this they are not unlike *Sampſon*'s Foxes joyned together by the Tails, whilſt their Heads look ſeveral ways; both aſſerting the ſame Poſition; tho' to different Ends; the one to eſtabliſh human Tradition, the other to undermine a Divine Ordinance. But I reply, nothing is more certain, than that the Ordinance of Baptiſm is inſtituted and appointed us in the Goſpel. But there is no diſtinct Precept, that particularly determines us to adminiſter it to thoſe of ſuch or ſuch an Age, or more to Perſons of one Age than another, but 'tis left to us to apply the Ordinance to thoſe we find qualified, according to the rules and directions given us in the Word of God, without any reſpect to the Age. Neither do I know the particular

ticular Age of any one baptized in Scripture. Unleſs that our Saviour was then about thirty Years old *; but who will ſay, that we are bound preciſely to obſerve that Time in our reception of Baptiſm? If you ſay in general Terms, it muſt be when we are come to the Age of Maturity or Diſcretion, let it be proved, that the Scripture either by Precept or Example hath limitted it to that only, or that the adult or grown Perſons are declared in Scripture to be the only qualified Perſons; or that thoſe in the ſtate of Infancy are declared not be qualified or capable, and you have gained the Point. But the Scripture ſhews that the one ſort are in this reſpect as qualified and capable as the other: And therefore the Precept makes it as much our Duty, to adminiſter Baptiſm to ſuch as are in the ſtate of Infancy, as to the Adult. We don't Baptize Infants as excluding grown Perſons, nor grown Perſons as excluding Infants: Before and under the Law they were commanded Circumciſion preciſely the eighth Day, but not ſo as to exempt others of other Ages. For *Abraham* was circumciſed at 99, and *Iſmael* at. 13 Years old †; and afterwards, if through neglect or otherwiſe the time laps'd, as in the inſtance about which *Moſes* ‖ was concerned, * or that of the Jews, while in the Wilderneſs, they were not excuſed altogether from being circumciſed.

Now I have demonſtrated that that Command of God, to keep his Covenant in the Sign thereof, whatſoever it be, is ſtill of force; and that as Children and others were concern'd to keep this Command, when Circumciſion was the Token; ſo Children and others

* Luke 3. 21, 22, 23. *Anſwering therein the legal Type of the Prieſts and Levites, who ordinarily entered not their Function till at that Age.* Num. 4. 3, 23, 30.

† Gen. 17. 24, 25.

‖ Exod. 24. 25.

* Joſhua 5. 2.

are in like manner bound to do ſo, now Baptiſm is the Token. I have alſo ſhewed that Children are as fully commanded to be baptized, as any others by Chriſt's Commiſſion. *Go Diſciple all Nations, baptizing them*: Their Diſcipleſhip is their qualification for the ſuſception of Baptiſm. And that Children, whoſe natural or adopted Parents are Believers, are Diſciples, I have aboundantly proved. Firſt, In that they have an intereſt in the Promiſe or Covenant. Secondly, In that they are made ſo, by God's graciouſly calling them in their Parents. Thirdly, Becauſe they are reckoned as ſuch by Chriſt, for that they belong to him. And Fourthly, Becauſe they are ſo called by the Holy Ghoſt. To all which he hath not returned a word in Anſwer. Seeing then ſuch are Diſciples, who can forbid Water, that they ſhould not be baptized? There being nothing in the Commiſſion, as I have obſerved, to interpoſe between diſcipling and baptizing.

If it be ſaid the Command don't run to Baptize all Diſciples, but to make Diſciples: And to Baptize thoſe that they make, and that 'tis not in the Power of Man to make Children Diſciples. I anſwer, this alters not the Caſe, as appears in the inſtance of *Saul* being baptized of *Ananias*, who yet was not made a Diſciple by him, but immediately by God. And they had it in their Commiſſion to Diſciple Children, as being part of a Nation; and 'tis not to be ſuppoſed that they were commanded Impoſſibilities. The plain truth of the matter is this, ſome Infants are and others may be made Diſciples, otherwiſe a Nation cannot be diſcipled, whereof Infants are

no

no ſmall part; or Chriſt gives in his Commiſſion what is impoſſible. To underſtand it of as many or few as Men liſt of a Nation, is againſt the ſenſe of the Scripture, which plainly is, That the whole of the Nations whereever they came was in their Commiſſion to Diſciple *. To this purpoſe compare Scripture-Propheſies †, with this Commiſſion given in charge by Chriſt ‖, and what the Spirit of God hath foretold in thoſe Propheſies, that in ſucceſſion of time muſt be effected; *When the Kingdoms of the Earth ſhall become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and his Chriſt* ‖. And in *Europe*, to look to no other parts of the World, it hath been happily accompliſhed. If they think to evade this by that diſtinction of the Apoſtle *, *they are not all* Iſrael *which are of* Iſrael: That diſtinction can be no otherwiſe applicable to the Chriſtian Nations, than to the Nation of *Iſrael*, and ſo 'twill ſtill entitle Chriſtian Nations to the Covenant of God, and to the Priviledge of Ordinances, notwithſtanding there be amongſt theſe Diſciples who are called, many that are not choſen. They have then the whole of the Nation in their Commiſſion; and it muſt be their endeavour in the utmoſt extent of the Word to Diſciple it; yet this Work in no one Nation can be done in an inſtant. As a Nation cannot be born, ſo it cannot in a Day be diſcipled: The meaning therefore is, to Diſciple Nations, that is the whole of any Nation, and being diſcipled to Baptize them; yet they are by degrees to Baptize, as they can Diſciple, till the whole of the Nation be diſcipled and baptized; which can never come to paſs, unleſs Children,

* Deut. 3. 28. Pſal. 2. 8. 72. 11. 86. 9. Mic. 4. 1.

† Qui dixit omnes nullos excludit neque parvulos, *ſaith St.* Ambr.

‖ Rev. 11. 15.

* Rom. 9. 6.

who are a conſiderable part, may be diſcipled.

But if this will not ſatisfie, unleſs they may underſtand too how they can be diſcipled: I Anſwer. Some are made Diſciples in their Parents; ſo that in diſcipling the Parents we Diſciple them. Others are made Diſciples by adopting them into the Family of Chriſt's Church; that is bringing them under a Chriſtian Government and Tuition; who are hence forth no more common or unclean, but ſeparate and holy, within the Covenant, and conſequently to be baptized; as thoſe that were adopted into *Abraham*'s Family were within the Covenant with others, and to be circumcized, tho' they were not of the Seed, as 'tis noted in the ſame verſe *, being they were under his Power and Education.

* Gen. 17. 12.

Thus, I hope, I have evinced, beyond all contradiction, that Chriſt's Commiſſion is as full for baptizing Infants, as any others. Therefore how many untruths may he be juſtly charged with and convicted of, who hath ſo often ſaid in his Papers, that we have not one Word of God, not one Precept or Precedent in Scripture for baptizing Infants?

THE

THE

SERMON

Preached on Occaſion of the Author's baptizing an Adult Perſon. With ſome Enlargements.

COLOS. II. 12.

Buried with him in Baptiſm, wherein alſo ye are riſen with him.

ALmighty God finding his ancient People the Jews too intent upon the Externals of Religion, without any due regard to the vital and ſubſtantial part thereof, the better to take them off from this their groſs and carnal way of worſhipping him, was pleaſed to declare by his Prophets againſt the very Rites and *Uſages* of his own Inſtitution; not that he did abſolutely prohibit them, and countermand what he had enjoyn'd, but diſclaimed and rejected theſe external, theſe leſſer matters, rather than the Spirit and Life of Religion ſhould be neglected by them; or the more weighty concerns of the Law be left undone. Thus St. *Paul* gives his *Coloſſians* here to underſtand,

that the inward Circumciſion of the Heart, is infinitely preferable to the outward Circumciſion of the Fleſh; and that tho' the Circumciſion of the Fleſh be now no more, yet God hath not left himſelf without a Witneſs in this Caſe, but has appointed another external Rite in its Room, *viz.* Baptiſm. *Buried with him in Baptiſm*, ſays the Text, whence we may note theſe following particulars.

Firſt, As the Words bear a Relation to, and are occaſionally introduced from the verſe foregoing; we may infer, that the Externals of Religion are not to be regarded in compariſon of its inward Life and Subſtance. The Circumciſion of the Fleſh, when the Commandment was moſt in force, was nothing to that of the Heart.

Secondly, We are given to underſtand that Baptiſm is the initiating Sacrament of the New Teſtament, and ſo ſucceeds Circumciſion, which was the initiating Sacrament of the Old.

Thirdly, We may note that our Baptiſm repreſents Chriſt's Burial and Reſurrection, in the manner of its Adminiſtration, or if not in the ſymbolical Ceremonies, yet at leaſt it doth and muſt in its ſpiritual Concomitants and Effects. And it behoves us to exemplifie Chriſt's bodily Actions and Paſſions in a ſpiritual way; that as he died and was buried, ſo ſhould we die, and even be buried unto Sin; and as he roſe, ſo ſhould we riſe to newneſs of Life, *Mortifying all our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all vertue and godlineſs of living*, as our Church exhorts.

For the Firſt, That the Externals of Religion are not to be regarded in compariſon of

of its inward Life and Subſtance. In the former Verſe the Apoſtle declares to his *Coloſſians*, that they are circumcized in Chriſt, that is by his Spirit, as the Margin of your Bibles of the *Geneva* Tranſlation hath it; and therefore they need not be ſo ſcrupulouſly Zealous after an external Rite; much leſs this of Circumciſion which is now antiquated. Since withall they want not an outward Rite in this reſpect, they have Baptiſm tho' Circumciſion be laid aſide and aboliſhed, they have another Sacrament inſtituted in its room, *Buried with him in Baptiſm.* Now ſhould you compare the Circumciſion of our Saviour, the inward Circumciſion of the Heart, with that of *Moſes*, the outward Circumciſion of the Fleſh, you will without difficulty perceive, that it infinitely ſurpaſſeth it in Dignity and Excellency; that wounded the Body, this enlivens the Soul: The one pared away a little Skin, and markt the Fleſh; the other mortifies the whole Body, and quickens the Spirit. And therefore they were extravagant, who notwithſtanding that excellent and Divine Circumciſion which Chriſtians have received, are yet ſo ſollicitouſly bent upon that which is but the Figure and Shadow. Nevertheleſs to ſhew how rich that ſanctifying Grace is, which we have in Jeſus Chriſt; he adds, that beſides our being circumciſed in heart, and ſo diveſted of the Body of the Sins of the Fleſh; we have moreover been buried with him in Baptiſm, in which we are alſo *riſen again with him*, which is a more excellent and lively Sacrament, than ever Circumciſion was; a Sacrament reſembling it, and anſwering to it; ſignifying and ſealing up both our Mortification

tion and Vivification. But then there is both an outward and an inward Baptiſm ; or, there is in Baptiſm the Body and the Spirit ; (as I might have ſaid in effect concerning Circumciſion) and the internal ſpiritual Part is the moſt material, and ought to be more eſpecially minded by us. The thing that ſaveth us is by St. *Peter* ſaid to be Baptiſm. 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. But that in Baptiſm which doth moſt contribute to our Salvation, next to the vertue of Chriſt's Reſurrection, is not the putting away the filth of the Fleſh, but the Anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God. Which ſhews the outward waſhing is the leaſt conſiderable, *q. d.* 'tis not ſo much the outward Adminiſtration as the Converſion of the Soul to God, that is the effective diſpoſition in which Baptiſm ſaveth us. God will have *mercy and not ſacrifice*; as he ſaid by his Prophet, *Hoſ. 6: 6.* that is rather than Sacrifice. Not that he did then renounce Sacrifice, but would rather have Acts of Mercy and Charity ſhewn to Man ; than any ſuch Sacrifices or Oblations offered or made to himſelf. He preferred not Mercy or Charity before inward Devotion, or the adoration of the Heart, the Sacrifice of a contrite Spirit, which he'll in no wiſe deſpiſe ; but before any outward Acts, or external Performances in his Service: which is of little or no account at all with him, where the inward ſpiritual Part is wanting, which is the very Soul and Life of Religion ; But it cannot be ſuppoſed he would not have Sacrifice too ; ſeeing he had given ſo many Commands concerning it: And therefore the Prophet immediately adds, that *he deſired the knowledge of God*

God more than burnt offerings, q. d. he did not deſire either Sacrifice or Burnt offerings, in the ſame degree with other more material Duties. So when St. *Peter* ſays, that 'tis not the outward waſhing with Water, that ſaveth us, but the inward Purification of the Spirit, we are not to ſuppoſe his meaning to be, that the outward waſhing is of no vertue, or that the Baptiſm of Water is wholly excluded; being an Ordinance of God; but that if we would approve our ſelves unto God, we muſt not reſt in an outward formal Worſhip: No not in Circumciſion, though the Law was never ſo much in being, or were renewed or reinforced. But we muſt Worſhip him inwardly with the Circumciſion of the Heart. So the ſealing of the Covenant in our Baptiſm, will be of little advantage to us, unleſs we make good our Stipulation, and can return ſome ſatisfactory Anſwer touching the Faith we have entertained, and the Reſolutions we have taken up, to live according to that Religion we are initiated into: Circumciſion availeth not, neither the outward Lavour of Baptiſm; without the inward Sanctification and renewing of the Holy Ghoſt. Hence ariſeth our great Miſcarriage, and the fruſtration of all the hopes and advantages of thoſe bleſſed Relations we are admitted to by Baptiſm, when from time to time we mind only the external Rite and Ceremony; which is low and mean, without conſidering the ſubſtance and reality; which is high and excellent. The Figure, the outward Element is poor and beggarly: The thing ſignified is rich and heavenly. The Seal is mean; the Inheritance is great. It hath differently fallen out

with

with the carnal Jew, and the carnal Chriſtian; the outward Glory of their Ordinances was a ſtumbling Block to them; which made them reſt in the Type, and look no further; the meanneſs of ours, is a ſtumbling Block with us; we look not for ſuch Treaſure in Earthen-Veſſels. Nor indeed can we, ſo long as we make the Ordinance a cuſtomary Piece of formality. But here I would not be thought to inſinuate the Non-neceſſity of the Ordinance of Baptiſm, which God hath appointed, as the way, in the common Order of means, to bring to Grace and Glory; for in this way he ordinarily brings us to Salvation. And therefore makes it our Duty: But he has not bound himſelf to outward means and inſtruments, and conſequently it cannot be ſaid to be of that univerſal abſolute neceſſity; as if there were no Salvation without it. The Covenant we know can convey Pardon and Salvation without the Seal. *Abraham* was juſtified before he received the ſign of Circumciſion: The ſeal of the Righteouſneſs of Faith. And the Thief upon the Croſs was ſaved without Baptiſm. But the Seal cannot do it without the Covenant, that is the great Inſtrument of Donation and Conveyance. Our Saviour preſcribing the ordinary way of Salvation, *Mark* 16. 16. ſays, *He that believeth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved*; but adds, *He that believeth not, ſhall be damned*: Not he that is not baptized. The Covenant of Grace, and our being in Chriſt is abſolutely neceſſary. But the Sign, the external Seal, is not of a like neceſſity. And yet it is of ſuch neceſſity too, that it cannot be neglected without Sin and Danger. To ſpeak ſummarily and briefly,

briefly, 'tis neceſſary, as a Law of Chriſt, as a part of his external Worſhip, as a Seal of the Covenant of the Promiſe of remiſſion of Sins, as a means of exhibiting and conveying of Grace, neceſſary as the ordinary way, by which in Conjunction with the Covenant, and the Grace of it, God doth ſave. And therefore none can neglect it, without great indignity to Chriſt, and great ingratitude for ſuch an high Priviledge and eminent Advantage. But ſtill we muſt take along with us this Caution: That this ſacred Ordinance be not paſt over, as a mere cuſtomary Thing, as an external Rite only, or Ceremony, without minding the thing ſignified; and the correſpondent of our part of the Covenant, which our Baptiſm Signs and Seals. Our common Negligence in the Duties incumbent on us, and in thoſe Conditions which our Baptiſm obligeth us to, is certainly one of the great Prejudices that hath hardned the Anabaptiſts, and made them look upon our Infant-Baptiſm, as a trifling Buſineſs, a mere inſignificant thing.

I proceed now to the next thing I noted, as the ſecond general Head, which I am in order to conſider, *viz.* That Baptiſm is the initiating Sacrament of the New Teſtament, and ſo ſucceeds Circumciſion, which was the initiating Sacrament of the Old. And to diſcuſs this the more fully and methodically; I will endeavour to ſhew you, Firſt, What Baptiſm or the Sacrament of Baptiſm is. Secondly, What it is to be baptized, or what are the Priviledges and Advantages that do accrue to us by our Baptiſm. And then in the Third Place, I ſhall endeavour to prove

that

that Baptiſm is the initiating Sacrament of the New Teſtament. As to the Firſt, The word Sacrament in its original intendment, had the ſignification of ſuch a Military Oath as was attended with ſacred Rites, and ſuch as led Men, by ſenſible reſemblances, to things of an higher nature. As for the Sacraments of the New Teſtament, particularly that of Baptiſm; we may conſider it in divers Reſpects; and ſo may take up various and diſtinct Notions and Conceptions concerning it. If we conſider it with reſpect to the Divine Grace, ſo it may and ought to be conceived by us, to be ſuch an outward and viſible Sign thereof, as is moreover ordained by Chriſt to be a means of conveying it unto us, and a pledge to aſſure us of the ſame. Secondly, With relation to our Virtue, or the embracing the Conditions on our Part: So 'twill be ſuch an outward viſible Sign thereof, and ought to be ſo reputed, as is appointed by Chriſt for us to make a Declaration of it, and an Obligation to continue this our Profeſſion, and to practiſe what we ſo publickly declare and profeſs. Thirdly, With reference to that New Covenant, by which the Divine Grace, and our Duty are as it were tied together, ſo it muſt be defined ſuch an outward and viſible Sign, as is ordained by the ſame Chriſt for God and Man to declare their mutual Conſent, and by that Rite explicitely to enter into the ſaid Covenant. Laſtly, As to thoſe who are joyned together in the ſame Covenant, and ſo are connected to Chriſt, and to one another, then 'tis ſuch an outward and viſible Sign, as is by Chriſt ordained and fitted as a general Badge of their common

Profeſſion: And a means of bringing particular Men into Society, Communion, and Fellowſhip one with another. In ſum, 'tis an outward and viſible Sign ordained and fitted by Chriſt, to ſignifie and convey and aſſure the Divine Grace unto us, and on our part to declare the Duty we owe to God, and to Chriſt, and to one another, and to oblige our ſelves to the conſtant Profeſſion and Practice of it *.

* *See* Towerſon *on the Sacraments.*

Having thus ſeen what we are to underſtand by the Sacrament of Baptiſm; let us conſider, (2.) What it is to be baptized. What are the Priviledges and Advantages, that do redound to the party baptized.

Firſt, Then to be baptized is by a ſolemn Rite to be explicitely admitted into Covenant with God; a Covenant of Grace, Pardon and Salvation, which Chriſt hath purchaſed with his Blood. And ſurely 'tis no ſmall Advantage to be brought into ſuch a State; whereby we are conſign'd to the Grace of the Goſpel, and the mercies of God: Who thereupon don't meaſure our performances by Grains and Scruples, by perfect unſinning Obedience; but with the allowances of the balance of the Sanctuary. Not exacting from us according to the ſtrict meaſures of the Law, but ſaving us by his Grace, or as it is elſewhere in Scripture expreſſed: *According to his mercy*. That is by pitying and pardoning us, by relieving and ſupporting us; becauſe he remembers that we are but Duſt. Some ſay that Baptiſm only waſheth away all the Sins that are paſt; or at preſent adhering; but not the Sins of our future Life. But this Sacrament promiſeth more and greater Things,

Things, even in *futurum*, and therefore is not repeated, becauſe it doth all at once, which it can do at a hundred times. For it admits us to a ſtate of Pardon, to the condition of Repentance, and the Evangelical Mercy. He that hath entred into this gate of Life, is always in the ready way of having his Sins forgiven, unleſs he turns aſide out of this Path, by renouncing his Baptiſm, and by utter Apoſtacy. The *Meſſalians* denied this, and 'twas part of their Hereſie to undervalue their Baptiſm, and to leſſen the Grace thereof *. But it was in purſuance of this Grace of Baptiſm, that St. *Paul* calls the lapſed *Galatians* to their Covenant of Baptiſm, and the Grace of God ſtipulated in that Sacrament †, and therefore wiſht them not to hope to be juſtified by the Law; ſeeing they are entred into the Covenant of Faith, and to be juſtified thereby. And this he proves, for that they have been baptized, this being the Covenant made in Baptiſm, the gate to all this Mercy. Wherefore he exhorts us to hold faſt the Profeſſion of our Faith, the Faith into which we were baptized, when we had not only the Truth of God's Promiſes abſolutely ſealed and Confirmed to us; but likewiſe an aſſurance of what God is ready to do for us, in a way of Grace and Mercy, on condition we be faithful in the duties of the Goſpel. For we muſt know that the Goſpel-Govenant, of which Baptiſm is the Sign, is not without its Conditions, which Baptiſm ſeals in a way of particular application, not only that upon the performing our part of the Covenant, we ſhall obtain the Grace; but it ſeals up to every receiver, their particular right in the

* *Whom you'l find confuted by* Iſidore Peluſiot, *lib.* 3. 195 *Epiſt.* ad *Herman.*

† Gal. 3. 26.

† Graces

Graces promiſed. If we do not forfeit all by violating and breaking the Covenant, and rend'ring our ſelves unworthy of the benefits of it. Hence the Sacrament of Baptiſm is ſaid by the Schools to be *gratiæ exhibitivum*, an Ordinance of exhibiting and conferring Grace to thoſe that are rightly baptized; not by its own Operation, but through the Operation of God alone: who in the right uſe of Baptiſm does always perform what he hath promiſed: For who can deny the effect when we have God's *fiat* for it. Some indeed aſcribe too much to Baptiſm, others leave it as a mere naked Sign. The bare Element, 'tis true, hath not a power and vertue to convey Grace. The Water is not a ſubject capable to receive it, and conſequently cannot convey it; it toucheth not the Soul, it cannot operate upon that, to infuſe real Grace; this would be to aſcribe that to the external Inſtrument, which is peculiar only to the great efficient Cauſe. What it conveys and confers is not from any vertue of its own, by its bare application, but by vertue of Chriſt's Inſtitution, and its relation to the Covenant. For this Reaſon its effects are not confin'd to the inſtant of its Adminiſtration. But it extends its efficacy and influence throughout our Lives, it continues a ſeal to the Covenant and the promiſes of Grace and Mercy; till the Covenant be utterly violated by abſolute Apoſtacy, or final Unbelief: And ſo it continues an Inſtrument to convey Grace during our whole Lives; not only remiſſion of Sins for the time preſent, but upon our perſeverance in the conditions of Faith and Repentance, it continues this Grace of

Pardon to us to the laſt Period. So that we are but once baptized for the remiſſion of Sins; though we daily contract Guilt; becauſe being once received it remains a perpetual Pledge and Teſtimony of the everlaſting Covenant of God; and of the continual waſhing away of Sin by the Blood of Chriſt. 'Twas therefore a cauſeleſs fear, occaſioned from the Novatian Errour, that made ſome of the Ancients defer Baptiſm till near their death, as tho' it did not continue to exhibit and convey the Grace of Pardon. But from what I have already noted, there is no reſting on the bare work done: All are not upon the receiving the external Baptiſm regenerate, and made partakers of internal Grace; as if it were neceſſarily annexed to the outward Ordinance. Real Sanctification doth not always accompany the Miniſtration of Baptiſm: Nevertheleſs the Ordinance is not without its effect, in a way of Grace; it doth confer on us in a Sacramental Way what it doth exhibit, and Seal to. And till there be a Bar put by Men's actual Rejection, thoſe that are truly baptized have a right to the Grace and Mercy ſealed. And tho' Baptiſm be not always an Inſtrument of infuſing real Grace: Yet hereby we are actually, *& de preſenti*, made partakers of relative Grace; and have a right to real ſanctifying Grace, in that way that God gives it; and ſo are partakers of relative Regeneration: Being as it were, born again into a new State of gracious Relations, Priviledges, and Hopes: And our Baptiſm is the Character and Sacramental Seal of this new bleſſed State of Adoption and Salvation. And this continues, as I have ſaid,

till

till there be a forfeiture on our Part; and he that will not call this Grace, knows not how to value things Spiritual. But how rich ſo ever this Baptiſmal Grace may be in its ſelf and effects, for the benefit of Infant-Innocency; 'tis not that which is the terms of our Salvation in riper Age, when we come under the guilt of actual Sins: Thoſe that arrive to the Years of Reaſon and Choice, to them the Goſpel tenders Salvation upon condition of actual Faith and Repentance. What is ſealed to us in our Infant-ſtate is continued to us, upon other conditions at Age: The Grace that is made over by the free Covenant of God, and ſealed in Baptiſm, confers a right to the baptized. So that if he dies in this State, he dies in this right: But there are other things required for the continuance of it, at years of Knowledge and Reaſon, which as it is a great Foundation of comfort touching the Salvation of dying Infants, and juſtifies that Clauſe formerly in the rubick for Baptiſm; ſo it deſtroys the vain preſumptions of others, and takes Men off from reſting on the Grace of Baptiſm, as if it were ſufficient for their Salvation; not conſidering whatever Mercy or Priviledge Baptiſm doth confirm, is continued to us upon other conditions, after we come to Age, and fall under the guilt of actual Sins.

Again, To be baptized, is to be enrolled a Member of the Church; incorporated into the Communion of Saints; ingrafted into Chriſt's Myſtical Body. The Apoſtle ſpeaking of Chriſt Myſtical, under the ſimilitude of a natural Body, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. ſaith, *We*

are baptized into Jesus Christ, into that noble blessed Society of which Christ is the Head; and to which belong the Adoption and the Covenant, and the Promises. It would be too large a digression, particularly to insist upon the Priviledges and Advantages of the Church of Christ, beyond the rest of the World. Sure I am, of all the judgments that God inflicted upon the Jews, none had comparably that fire of Fury, that terrour of Wrath in it, which was executed in the accomplishment of the threatning mentioned, *Zach.* 11. 9, 10. upon their heinous Provocation, in crucifying the Lord of Life, which filled up the number of their Sins. Upon which they were rejected, cut off from the Olive-Tree, and their Church-enclosure pluckt down: So that they were no longer his peculiar People, but were left in common with the rest of the World; without God, without Christ, and so without all hope of Salvation. Whereas they only that are added to the Church, that are separated to be God's peculiar Inheritance among all the Tribes of the Earth; are in the way to be saved; as being the sole objects of his special Care and Providence: And therefore it must needs be a blessed Priviledge to be brought within the Pale; to be owned by God under such a Relation: Now into this Body, this Society, this holy Corporation, we are baptized. And as the Church, in its Constitution is blessed of God, beyond all the World: So all its Members have the advantage of other benefits flowing from the Communion of Saints, in order to their spiritual

tual and eternal Good. As the labours and ſervices of God's Miniſters and Ambaſſadors all are theirs, whether *Paul* or *Apollos*, or *Cephas*, they are all Servants of Chriſt, for the edifying this his Body, and the building of them up, till they come to Perfection. Again, they have the inviſible guard of Angels, watching over, and miniſtring for the good of ſuch as are Heirs of Salvation; they have all an intereſt in the Charity, Love, and Prayers of the whole Myſtical Body; all joyning in common in their Liturgies for every ſingle Member, how e're divided from one another, by Countries and Languages; yea every ſingle Member of this Body hath the united ſtrength of the Prayers of all the Saints on Earth; and I doubt not but in a general manner, the Prayers of all the glorious Society; the crowned part of the Church in Heaven; our elder Brethren; who have finiſhed their warfare, and do now poſſeſs the Kingdom of Glory. Should we go no further, we may reflect, and thankfully acknowledge, this happy Priviledge; to be called to this ſtate of Salvation. Hence we are brought into a ſtate of Union with Chriſt; made Members of his Myſtical Body, and partakers of the influences of his favour, in all the means and ordinances, helps and advantages, whereby he declares himſelf the Saviour of the Body; By vertue of this Union, all the ſpecial ſaving Graces of his purchaſe are freely offered, the doors of Mercy ſtand open to us, and the gate of Life and Glory is ready to receive us; provided we abide in him, *Hold the head from which all the body*, as the Apoſtle ſays,

Coloſ. 2. 19. *by joynts and bands have nouriſhment miniſtred*, and ſo don't ſeparate from him by Apoſtacy, and fall off by an evil heart of unbelief; by an impenitent courſe of Sin and Wickedneſs; ſo long I ſay as we maintain this Union, we ſhall not fail to receive influences of Grace, and ſpiritul Life, till we come to Glory.

Having conſidered what the Sacrament of Baptiſm is, and the Priviledges and Advantages that redound from thence, I come to evince the truth of the general Propoſition, *viz.* That the Ordinance of Baptiſm, is the initiating Sacrament of the New Teſtament, and ſo ſucceeds Circumciſion, which is generally granted to be the initating Sacrament of the Old.

In order to this, let it be premiſed, that there can be no Reaſon given, why we ſhould not be by ſome rite matriculated Members of the Chriſtian as well as heretofore, they were thus ſolemnly initiated into the Jewiſh Church. Now what other way is preſcribed to us of doing this, than by Baptiſm; the moſt proper rite for this purpoſe, as it hath been in a manner all along accounted? This rite of Initiation, of admitting Perſons into religious Societies, was uſed by the Poſterity of *Noah*, at leaſt very early among the Jews. Their Enquiry, *John* 1. 25, 28. ſounds as much as a tacit acknowledgment of their practiſing it, (though not as a Sacrament till the *Meſſiah* had confirmed it); for which we have the Teſtimonies of their Rabbies, cited by the learned Doctor *Hammond* *. And Biſhop *Taylor* is inclined to give the more credit

Vid. Wills *againſt* Danvers, *pag.* 7.

* *In his Query of Infant-Baptiſm.*

credit to ſuch Authorities; becauſe the Heathen (as he ſaith) had the ſame Rite in many Places, and in many Religions. Hence a *Proſelyte* is called in *Arrianus* βεβαμμένον one baptiſed: Baptiſm being his ſolemn Inveſtiture, who ſhould enter into any Sect or Religion; being thereupon reckoned one of that Sect or Religion. A *Proſelyte* or Convert, in the Apoſtle's Phraſe, ſuch an one is ſaid to be *added to the Church*. The Jews have a Tradition that *Sarah* and *Rebeckah*, when they were adopted into the Family of the Church; that is the Church reſpectively, as it was in *Abraham*'s and *Iſaac*'s Houſe, were baptized. In St. *Paul*'s Catechiſm Baptiſm is reckoned, as part of the Foundation of the firſt Principles of Religion; and ſo proper for Babes: Whereby they are matriculated and adopted (as a late Reverend *Prelate* expreſſeth it) into the Houſe of their Father, and taken into the hands of their Mother. This then is the ordinary method God hath taken of *adding to the Church*, ſuch as ſhould be ſaved: And therefore it cannot be denied, but that Baptiſm, as an initiating Rite, ſucceeds Circumciſion: And my Text will avouch for the truth thereof: For the Apoſtle having told the *Coloſſians*, that they had *the Circumciſion made without hands*, the Circumciſion of the Heart: He further ſignifies, by way of implication, that they had as good as the outward Circumciſion too, by being baptized; or he could have no occaſion to add, *buried with him in Baptiſm*. And his Argument had been a mere *Non ſequitur*, unleſs he gave them to underſtand thereby, that Baptiſm

ſucceeded, and came in place of Circumciſion. And that this was the genuine Senſe and intendment of the Apoſtle, I have, I conceive, not only more fully illuſtrated, but demonſtrated in the foregoing Diſcourſe *, whereto I refer the Reader.

* Pag. 43.

I proceed in the third Place to ſhew, that as Chriſt's Death, ſo his Burial and Reſurrection are not only exemplified in the Ceremony and manner of its Adminiſtration; but that they ought to be exemplified after a ſpiritual manner, in the bleſſed effects and fruits of that Holy Sacrament, *viz.* In our Mortification and Vivification.

Firſt, As to the Symbol or Ceremony, Chriſt's Burial and Reſurrection may be, and are repreſented in the external Action of that Sacrament, or manner of its adminiſtration. And the Apoſtle ſeems to allude to a Practice, which might then be uſed by ſome in thoſe hot Countries, *viz.* Of dipping or putting the whole Body under Water in Baptiſm. But foraſmuch as the Word Baptize, carries not always that ſignification, or import; and for that there is no Command, that Baptiſm ſhould be always adminiſtred exactly after that manner, ſuch a Practice cannot be binding to us: So that ſhould it be granted, that there are ſome very probable inſtances and examples in Scripture, of dipping and immerging the whole Body in Baptiſm, as it muſt be granted, there are as likely examples and inſtances of only ſprinkling and pouring on of Water: This will only argue, that we cannot thereby be bound up to either way. But

are

are at liberty to administer it, according to the more prevailing custom, where we live. Moreover, this Ceremony of dipping cannot be practised towards Infants, without great inconvenience and even danger of their Lives, in so tender an Age, and in so cold a Country as ours is; especially in the Winter Season.

But here the Anabaptists step in, and urge from hence their way of dipping, and think this is enough for them, not only to plead in their own justification, but to confute our way of baptizing, only by sprinkling or pouring on of Water. Accordingly a certain Person who takes upon him, to Answer my foregoing Discourse, hath these very words: Baptism must be by dipping, not sprinkling; because Baptism rightly administred, doth figure out the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ. But I know not wherein sprinkling doth it. And then citing *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. he immediately subjoyns: When the Body is put down under Water, O what resemblance is this of the Burial of Christ! And the rising of the Body up out of the Water of his Resurrection! This is not so pointed out by sprinkling. Now for Answer hereto, to avoid Repetition; see the Reply, Page the 80. And grant that we do not in our way of administring at least so exactly and fully represent Christ's Burial and Resurrection; of which, as I have shewn, there is no absolute necessity that it should be so done in the Ceremony; it will concern us nevertheless to consider, how we may be said to be buried and risen with Christ, in a

spiri-

ſpiritual figurative Senſe; and to ſee, that the fruits and conſequence of our Baptiſm do anſwer, as his Death, ſo his Burial; which ſpeaks not only our dying unto Sin, but our continuing and perſevering in this ſtate of Mortification, and likewiſe his Reſurrection in our ſymbolizing therewith, in riſing to newneſs of Life.

Firſt, As to our Burial with Chriſt, our Saviour's lying three Days in the Grave, puts it beyond all doubt, that he was in the ſtate of the Dead; ſo true believers are buried with him. But how can that be, you'l ſay, that we who are true believers ſuppoſe, being yet living, can be buried with him, we never were laid in the Grave? Surely not in our Lords! Which was ſcituate on Mount *Calvary*, nigh to *Jeruſalem*; places very diſtant from our abode. But we muſt know that 'tis not a natural, but a Myſtical Grave or Sepulchre that the Apoſtle refers to, and ſo we may be ſaid, in a figurative Senſe, to be buried with Chriſt, and that in a double Reſpect. Firſt, In regard of our juſtification for the remiſſion of Sins. Secondly, With reſpect to our ſanctification and the mortification of the old Man. Concerning the firſt, 'tis certain, as he was not crucified and put to Death, ſo neither was he buried, which is nothing but the conſequent of Death, but for us; and having under-gone Death, and deſcended to the diſmal ſtate of the Grave for our Salvation; 'tis evident, that when he was buried, we were buried in him and with him; ſince 'twas properly for us that he deſcended into the Grave; in that his burial

hath

hath discharged this part of our Punishment, and consequently hath changed the nature of our Graves, that instead of being Prisons and Places of Execution, our Graves are now so many Beds, and Dormitories; wherein our Bodies do repose until the Resurrection. But 'tis not in this sense that the Apostle saith here we are buried with Christ, but he speaks rather of the first Part of our Sanctification, the Mortification of the old Man in us and its Burial, that is the bringing of it to nought; forasmuch as by Christ's Death and Burial, our old Man the body of Sin hath been destroyed and suffered a Death and Burial, like to Christ's; that as his Flesh after it was deprived of Life, was laid in the Grave, in like manner the old Man of true Believers having been slain, is interred. 'Tis in him and with him that we have been buried in this sort. If he had not suffered the one and the other for our Salvation, had not I say his Death and Holy Sepulchre derived unto us an Image and a Copy of his Burial, destroying and burying by the vertue and merits thereof, our old Man, and bringing on him a Mystical Death and Burial, Sin would still live and reign in us. In like manner the latter Clause of my Text must be so understood, *viz.* That Christ by vertue of his Resurrection doth work and produce one in us, which has Resemblance and Analogy with his own, *viz.* A Resurrection to a new Spiritual and Evangelical Life, instead of that vile and wretched Life which we had by Nature; without which we had lain still dead and in bondage to Sin. For that which formeth

eth in us the new Man, and gives us the courage to renounce the World, that we may live above the World, is the perſwaſion of the love of God, and the pardon of our Sins, together with the hope of a bliſsful glorious Immortality, of which he gives us aſſurance, from his having taken poſſeſſion of the ſame for himſelf and us. Theſe are the bleſſed effects and fruits iſſuing, as from the Death, ſo from the Burial and Reſurrection of Chriſt, which are ſealed to us in the Ordinance of Baptiſm. Indeed all the means and ordinances which God hath appointed, and enjoyn'd us to make uſe of in Religion, have no other tendency, but to communicate Jeſus Chriſt to us, as dead, buried, and riſen again for us, to the deſtroying of the old Man, and reviving the new; nor do they ever fail to produce theſe effects, in any of thoſe that receive them as they ought, and are not wanting in their Duty. But the Apoſtle ſpeaks here only of Baptiſm, the firſt and proper Sacrament, or means of Regeneration. So treating of the ſame Subject elſe-
* Rom. 6. 3. where *, he expreſſeth himſelf in like manner; which ſhould confute their folly, who withſtood one of the old Sacraments of *Moſes*, its giving place to this of Chriſt's inſtitution, ſo productive of this double effect, and which is alſo repreſented as our Apoſtle here intimates, and as I have already obſerved, in the external Action, and manner of Adminiſtration. But ſuppoſe ſprinkling does not carry ſo expreſs a Figure of Chriſt's Burial and Reſurrection, as that of immerſion or dipping; nevertheleſs the vertue of Holy Baptiſm is

ſtill the ſame. If therefore we meet with any baptized Perſons, as there are but too many ſuch, in whom the old Man is ſo far from being buried, that he lives and reigns with abſolute Power; and the new Man hath neither Life nor Action at all: It may not be imputed to Chriſt, who always accompanies his Sacraments with his ſaving vertue; but unto their own unbelief, who do wretchedly repel the operation of the Grace God, and obſtruct the effects which he would have aſſuredly produced in them, if their unworthineſs had not fruſtrated his efficacy towards them: And therefore 'tis added, *Through the faith of the operation of God*, an evident Token, that the Sacrament doth mortifie Sin in us, and raiſe us to Holineſs, according to the Faith it meets with in us. Now how happy ſhould we be, if we had theſe things Written and Engraven in deep Letters on our Hearts; if our actions did juſtifie our Profeſſion; *that we are buried, and riſen again with Chriſt in Baptiſm, by the faith of the operation of God*; but alas, it muſt be confeſt to our ſhame, there appears in the lives of moſt of us, a very imperfect Idea, of the Burial, and leaſt of all of the Reſurrection of Chriſt, the Fleſh lives and exerciſeth great Tyranny in us. The new Man, that breaths nothing but Heaven, and loves nothing but Holineſs, hath no place in us; 'tis ſo far from reigning there, that he, acts no more than a dead Body faſt ſhut up in the Grave. There is no need to run to *Paleſtine*, nor to go up to Mount *Calvary*, for to enter into his Sepulchre, you are entered into it, and buried with

with him, if by Faith you do mortifie and deſtroy the Body of Sin; to this end we are baptized. Nor is it a whit the more neceſſary for having part in his Reſurrection, to go and kiſs the laſt Print of his Feet, upon *M. Olivet.* We are riſen with him, if being affected with the glory he brought out of his Tomb, and convinced of the truth of the diſcoveries he made of a bleſſed Immortality, we live, as becomes the Goſpel, in all holy Converſation; all the Graces and Priviledges, of which Baptiſm is a ſign and ſeal on God's Part, are continued to us upon performance of that Duty, to which Baptiſm is an Engagement on our Part; and there is no Grace of God, but tends to lay an Obligation on us. The Grace which hath appeared unto us in the Goſpel teacheth us to deny ungodlineſs and worldly Luſts, and to live righteouſly and holily; for 'tis naturally inconſiſtent, that we ſhould be happy partakers of the bleſſed effects of God's Love and Favour, and the merits of Chriſt; unleſs we be holy: and therefore, as we have the priviledge to be buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm, or to be baptized into him, ſo 'tis neceſſary that we put on Chriſt, as our great Lawgiver and Example, to live according to the rule of his holy Doctrine and Precept, and to walk in that way which he hath trod before us. For in the Inſtitution of Baptiſm our Lord did not only deſign a benefit to us; ſo as to make it an Inſtrument of Advantage in a way of Grace, but alſo to bring us under an Obligation of Duty. As then we value the Priviledge; let us not neglect the Duty. As we are

glad

glad of the mercy offered: So let us mind the Stipulation on our Part, what an obligation lies upon us, to live a Chriſtian life, ſolemnly to reſolve upon the profeſſion and practice of the Law of Chriſt, according to our utmoſt Capacity, and the Ability God hath given us: So that tho' in our Infancy, the faith and repentance of our Parents or Proparents, ſuch I mean by whom we are adopted, may be reckoned as ours by vertue of God's Promiſe to Believers and their Seed: Yet if in due time, we do not perſonally believe and repent, our Baptiſm is made fruſtrate and vain, 'tis then in our Choice, either to reſcind or annul our Baptiſm, and to turn Heathens or Apoſtates: Or to ratifie and confirm the ſame. If we diſclaim and renounce our Baptiſm: We do in effect diſclaim and renounce all Right and Title, claim and intereſt in the promiſes of Chriſt; we caſt him off, tread his Blood under Foot, as an unholy Thing: Neither can we expect any ſtrength from him againſt Temptations; but are left in the Power, and under the dominion of all Sin and Villany. We renounce the Article of remiſſion of Sins, and the claim and right which otherwiſe we might have to everlaſting Life. But if we ſubmit to the terms of the Covenant, and embrace the Conditions, we ſtand obliged and bound to lead a mortified and a Holy Life; to be implanted into the ſimilitude of Chriſt's Death and Reſurrection; or we make void the Grace of God, and moſt unworthily forfeit and reject it, by breaking Covenant with him. Theſe things being conſidered, we cannot

chuſe

chuſe but confeſs, that as it was a great act of Charity in our Friends, ſo early to engage us in ſo beneficial an Indenture: So we are bound to ſtand to their Engagement, which they made in our Name, and to obſerve the Conditions of it, through the whole courſe of our Lives; eſpecially conſidering, that as God hath by his own Inſtitution and Appointment, put us under a ſtrict Obligation of Duty, ſo we have by our Baptiſm ſubmitted to the terms, and actually undertaken the Conditions. Having to this purpoſe entered into a moſt ſolemn League and Covenant, and as it were ſubſcribed thereunto; promiſing and vowing unto God, to anſwer our Engagement, to our utmoſt Ability: So that the Vow and Covenant of God is upon us, to live as his Servants, as Men who are dead to Sin, and alive unto God: *Know you not*? was the ſharp and cutting expoſtulation of St. *Paul* to all licentious Chriſtians; *Rom.* 6. 3. who preſume, when once they are baptized into the Church of Chriſt, and profeſs themſelves Chriſtians, and partake of the Ordinances, they may then live as they liſt, and be ſaved however. This is intimated in the firſt Verſe of that 6th to the *Romans*, where 'tis ſaid, *Let us continue in ſin that grace may abound*; as if ſome had thus flattered themſelves, that though they continued in the courſe of their Sins, yet however grace and mercy from Chriſt would abound towards them and ſave them. But the Apoſtle, as ſtartled at ſuch an Imagination, crys out, *God forbid*! God forbid ſuch a horrid thought ſhould poſſeſs any of our Hearts; and then

ſubjoins

ſubjoyns the impoſſibility, that any ſuch foul imagination ſhould prevail upon the Heart and life of any regenerate Chriſtian; which would be as ſtrange a Prodigy, as if the dead ſhould riſe out of their Graves, and Walk, and Live, as they did in their life time; and thereupon he bids them to look to their Baptiſm; for that they cannot be Ignorant, that when they *were baptized into Chriſt Jeſus, they were baptized into his death*; and here in my Text, *buried with him in Baptiſm.* And doth the Death, the Burial of Chriſt, ſtand for a Cypher? Hath Chriſt his Death and Burial, no tye upon us in this holy Sacrament? Hath it no Power, Vertue, or Influence? Certainly it hath done us little good, if we exemplifie it not in the death and mortification of Sin: This is the duty of every baptized Chriſtian. So far neceſſary, that we can have no benefit by our Baptiſm, no portion in Chriſt, or in his Death and Burial, but by our being dead and even buried unto Sin.

If it be ſaid, how muſt we be thus dead to Sin, to have any ſhare in Chriſt and his Death? For we cannot ſay we are dead to it, we find it ſtill lively and ſtirring in us, and too much prevailing with us. I anſwer, We are then dead to Sin, when we live not any longer therein. And that is (to expound the Apoſtle's meaning) Firſt, When we do not only refrain, and forbear our Sins for a while, but do really aim at no leſs than the mortification of our Luſts. Secondly, When though we are not quite dead to Sin, yet we

are not dead in Sin, but are ſenſible of the Venom and Sting of it. Thirdly, When though we cannot live, and not Sin; yet we donot live in it: 'Tis not as our Life, ſo far from that, that 'tis grievous to us, 'tis as Death. Laſtly, When, though our Sins be not quite dead, yet they are languiſhing and decaying, in a lingering and dying ſtate: and if we commit Sin; yet we do not continue in it, but repent and turn from it. But how ſhall we, you'l ſay, thus mortifie our Sins? Why we muſt fetch our Weapons againſt our prevailing Luſts from our Baptiſm: As *David* took the ſmooth Stones out of the Brook of Water, with which he ſlew *Goliab*, 1 *Sam.* 17. 40. So ought we to draw help and directions, from the Water of Baptiſm, to deaden the force of the moſt Giant-like Sin, and to lay it at our Feet: Yea our Baptiſm doth not only direct us herein, holding forth the conditions on our Part, what Duty is incumbent upon us, and likewiſe impower and enable us for the Encounter, as it conveys unto us the Grace of God, and the aſſiſtance of his Spirit; but moreover it obligeth us thereto in the higheſt nature, by the moſt ſolemn and the ſtrongeſt Bonds that may be; in that we Vow to God through Chriſt to perform it. The firmeſt Obligation imaginable; upon the deepeſt penalty, as ever we hope to have an intereſt in Chriſt, or in the Death of Chriſt, *q. d.* we diſclaim all hope and intereſt in Chriſt, and his Death, if we be not the Death of every ruling Sin in us. This ſurely is enough to make us beſtir our ſelves;

and

and ſet upon it, and even to compel us to it. When the forty Jews, (*Act.* 23. 12.) *Bound themſelves with an Oath, that they would neither eat nor drink, till they had killed Paul*; how did the conſciouſneſs of this Oath urge them to lie in wait for him! *v.* 16. and how reſolved were they upon his Death with all ſuddenneſs! *And we*, ſaith they, *e're he come near, are ready to kill him*, *v.* 15. We are under ſuch an Oath to God by our Vow of Baptiſm, to mortifie and kill our prevailing Sins; as theſe were to kill *Paul*; theirs was unjuſt, to murther an Innocent; ours moſt juſt and neceſſary, to Execute the greateſt Traytor in the World. And therefore let us remember, when our hearts would fain ſpare our Sins, and any way indulge them: That this ſacred Vow is upon us. What was the Reaſon *Jonathan* durſt venture to taſt of the Hony in the Wood, when the *Iſraelites* durſt not touch it, 1 *Sam.* 14. 27? He conſidered not the Oath by which he and they were obliged not to eat of it. So why do you thus follow and purſue ſuch and ſuch a pleaſing profitable Sin? You mind not the Oath, the Sacrament, the Vow, in which you are obliged, not to taſt ſuch forbidden Fruit; but on the contrary *to renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, and all the ſinful luſts of the fleſh.* But to come more near and home in the way of Application; Is Baptiſm an Ordinance that engages us to Duty, and that as the Condition of the continuance of the Benefits contained in the Promiſes and

Covenant to which it is the Seal? We ſee what a Foundation of looſe vain hope, a bare Baptiſmal Chriſtianity is: What ſlight tinctured Chriſtians thoſe are, that have only the outward waſhing of Baptiſm, but abandon the practice of a Chriſtian Life: Who pleaſe themſelves in a Sign, without the effect; and boaſt themſelves in a Figure and Shadow, without the Subſtance and Grace of it. The Baptiſm of Water, howſoever it may avail us in the ſtate of Infancy, in which ſtate God requires no actual Performance of Duty: Yet when we grow up to Years of Knowledge and Reaſon, and come under the Law of Duty, it availeth nothing, without the Baptiſm of the Spirit in actual Regeneration and Sanctification; I mean without an actual Repentance and Abrenunciation of Sin and Satan, and the practice of a Holy Life. Our Baptiſm will but remain as a Teſtimony againſt us of our perfidious violation of the Covenant of God, and of the falſeneſs and treachery of our evil Hearts, who pretend to be and own our ſelves the Subjects and Servants of Jeſus Chriſt, and yet baſely revolt from and diſobey him: This is to ſpeak Chriſt fair, and then to betray him. Mens receiving the name of Chriſt's Diſciples and Servants in Baptiſm, makes the Diſobedience of their ſinful Lives more hateful and abominable. In this reſpect ſome had an erroneous conceit of Old, which made them defer their Baptiſm, thinking they had a greater Liberty before than after their Baptiſm; and therefore were wont to ſay in St. *Auſtin's* time,

time, *Sine illum facere, nondum baptizatus eſt*; let him alone, he is not yet baptized; implying the ſtrict Obligation that lies upon Men by Baptiſm unto Holineſs of Life: What is Chriſtian Baptiſm without a Chriſtian Life? 'Tis not this external Badge or Cognizance, 'tis not a common profeſſion that follows it, that will be a Title to Heaven. 'Tis in vain to pretend that we have been baptized into Chriſt, or are buried with him in Baptiſm, and have made profeſſion of his name; if we be workers of iniquity; our doom at laſt will be to depart from him. That which is moſt material and conſiderable in our Baptiſm, and which moſt contributes to our eternal Intereſt and Salvation, is not (as at firſt I noted from St. *Peter*) the putting away the filth of the Fleſh: But the Anſwer of a good Conſcience towards God. What then doth our Conſcience anſwer, touching the performance of the Conditions on our Part? We build our hopes and confidences upon the Sands, unleſs we keep the Faith whereinto we are baptized, and perform the Duty to which our Baptiſm obligeth. How vainly do Men bear themſelves up, upon the Title of an outward Baptiſm, as if thereby they were good Chriſtians! though the courſe of their Lives be a flat Contradiction to the holineſs and purity of the Chriſtian Religion, and in effect the renouncing of it! The truth is, there is a ſad anſwering of this Engagement, in the generality of thoſe that are baptized. What backſliding from, and violations of the baptiſmal Covenant! From the obſervation

of whoſe Lives, a Heathen might conclude, as *Salvian* complained of old, *Si Chriſtus ſancta docuiſſet*, if Chriſt had taught holineſs, why don't Chriſtians practiſe it? Either, as he goes on, your Chriſt is no God, who allows ſuch evil Lives, or you are no Chriſtians who practiſe ſuch Things. Are they Chriſtians, are they dedicated to the honour and ſervice of God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, who lead ſuch impure Lives, who ſlight the ways of Religion, and ſet at nought the Laws and Commands of Chriſt, and are ſo devoted to the ways of their own evil hearts? Would Men but conſider how they have performed their Covenant with God, into which they were entered by Baptiſm, and what an aggravation of the Sin of their unholy unchriſtan Life ariſeth hence, this muſt needs give a check to their ſinful Carreer. If Infidels, and they that know not God do Blaſpheme his holy Name, and fight againſt Heaven by their open Impieties, this is no ſuch great Wonder; but for you that have given up your names unto Chriſt, that have dedicated your ſelves by Covenant to his Honour and Service, to break thoſe ſacred Bonds, and to ſtand it out in your Impenitency and Rebellion againſt God, and to live like Gentiles, his profeſſed Enemies; to forſake him and his ways, and to wallow in the impurities of an evil Converſation, is unaccountable. How dreadful will the Day be, when the Lord ſhall come to avenge him of his Adverſaries? You ſhall not periſh under ſuch eaſie Circumſtances of Wrath and Vengeance,

geance, as do the Gentiles. The Aggravation of your Sin and Judgment will be the treading under Foot the Blood of the Covenant. Thus far in general.

But to proceed to ſome particulars, and ſo to make ſome further improvement, by way of uſe, of what hath been delivered on this Subject. Doth holy Baptiſm admit us to a ſtate of ſuch high Priviledges and Advantages, as I have obſerved? Then we may ſee how injurious they are who deny Baptiſm to Infants; and ſo as much as lies in them keep them from Chriſt, I mean in the viſible way, in which we are brought unto Chriſt; from that Grace, which is the internal myſtery of this ſacramental Ordinance. In which reſpect we are ſaid *to be baptized into Chriſt*, if they have any right to the grace and ſpiritual Benefits, which are the Myſtery, the Spirit and Life of this Sacrament, why not to the external Symbolical ſignification and Seal of it? Shall Men hinder them from this viſible application of the Grace of Baptiſm? If we affirm they have no right to this Grace, what greater uncharitableneſs and preſumptuous ſtraightning the favour of God and Chriſt? For where has he debarred and excluded them from his Covenant and Promiſes, and caſt them out of that Body, whereof he is the Head, and the Saviour. Certain it is, this was one of the great Bleſſings of the Covenant with *Abraham*; *I will be thy God, and the God of thy Children after thee.* Thus ran the Promiſes of old, *He ſheweth mercy unto thouſands of generations of them that love him,*

and keep his commandments; the ſeed of the righteous is bleſſed: Children are the heritage of the Lord. They had the Seal of the Covenant, Circumciſion externally applying the Promiſes: And are the favours of Chriſt more narrow under the Goſpel, who is yet the Mediator of a better Covenant? Has Chriſt only a love for the Parents, and none for the Children? and yet hath told us, *if the root be holy, ſo are the branches*; Is not Chriſt the Redeemer of Infants? Did he purchaſe no Pardon, no Grace, or remiſſion of Sins for them? How abominably injurious would this be to Chriſt, and the fullneſs of his Oblation and Merit! Will Chriſt give them no place in his myſtical Body, in his Church and Kingdom? And yet, when he was upon Earth, commanded the little Children to be brought unto him, and took them into his Arms, and bleſſed them, declaring that ſuch did belong to his Kingdom; *of ſuch is the kingdom of God*, Mark 13. 14. If the Infants of Believers under the Goſpel be not capable of the Grace ſigned and ſealed, then there will follow many ſad unſcriptural Conſequences: Then they belong not to the Church and Body of Chriſt, they are in the ſame Caſe with the Children of Infidels, left without as common and unclean. This Principle mingles the holy Seed with the Heathens, and renders the favours of the Goſpel more narrow than thoſe of the legal Covenant, and the Chriſtian Seed in much worſe Circumſtances, than the Jewiſh. Yea they would not only be without the Church, but with-

without the Covenant; and ſo without Chriſt, or any ſpecial relation to him. So far without as are the Gentiles, Dogs and Strangers: While they are diſputed out of the Covenant, all well grounded hopes of their Juſtification and Salvation are diſputed away, dying in that State. 'Tis vain to recur to the ſecret Election of God, for the grounds of this Hope. Faith and Hope muſt be grounded upon ſome Word of God: If God have excluded them from the Covenant of Salvation, how ſhall we conclude that they belong to the Election of God? And if the Caſe were ſo, well may the Parents of dying Infants, mourn over them as thoſe that have no hope. All thoſe then are raſh groundleſs uncharitable Concluſions, highly derogatory to the Love of God, to the infinite riches and freeneſs of his Grace. But on the other hand, if God and Chriſt have not excluded them from the Grace of Baptiſm, the Mercy and Grace which is there ſignified, who ſhall forbid Water, the external ſealing Application? If God have not denied the greater, who ſhall deny the leſs; if God have not excluded them from the Subſtance and Myſtery, why ſhall they be denied the external Rite and Symbol? Either then they muſt be highly uncharitable, in denying Infants the Grace of Baptiſm, and ſo leave them in an evil Caſe; or elſe be very unjuſt, in denying them the Seal, where God grants them the ſubſtance.

Thirdly, Let this ſerve to humble thoſe that walk unworthy of this Priviledge of being baptized, and thereby admitted into the fellow-

fellowſhip of Chriſt's Religion, initiated Members of his Church. Can it ſeem a light thing in our Eyes, that when God has paſſed by the greateſt part of the World, as ſtrangers from his Family and Kingdom, and hath left them under the Kingdom of Satan, and taken us, no better by Nature than they are, to be his peculiar ones, into Covenant with himſelf, and to train us up under ſuch heavenly Ordinances: We ſhould notwithſtanding walk as Rebels and Enemies unto him, like the unbaptized World? Do we know into what a Covenant he hath taken us, what he hath done for, and expects from us? What means then our Converſation, ſo repugnant to our Profeſſion? Is it becauſe we renounce the Covenant, as being made when we underſtood it not? If there be any ſuch Apoſtates, let them take their Courſe, ſerve the God they have choſen. But ſay what iniquity, what ill is there in this Covenant of your Baptiſm, what diſadvantage have you met withal? Or how, or where do you hope to find better things, than what are here exhibited and enſured? Than, for inſtance, for God to be your Father, Chriſt your Saviour, the Spirit your Comforter; than to have your Sins pardoned and remitted; than to be adopted, juſtified, ſanctified, and every way comfortably provided for here, and in the end eternally ſaved. Do the Gods you have choſen to ſerve provide better things than theſe, that you renounce Chriſt for their ſake? If you ſay God forbid you ſhould ſo do, you hope to be ſaved by him, as well as

any

any other; then tell me ſeriouſly, do you expect that Chriſt ſhould ſtand bound to perform his Part of the Covenant, and you left at liberty, whether you diſcharge your part or no? That he ſhould love you, and you hate him? That he ſhould be your God, and you remain the Devil's Servants? That he ſhould provide Heaven for you, and you walk in the way that leads to Hell? Be not deceived, he hath ſworn the contrary, and hath heaped up Tribulation and Wrath for every Soul that doth Evil. For that Perſon more eſpecially, who, though baptized, hath profaned and made the Blood of the Covenant as an unholy Thing.

Fourthly, Let the conſideration of this great Priviledge excite us to a Holy Life, to live as Men who are dead to Sin, and alive unto God. To make account, that it ought to be as ſtrange, to ſee a baptized Perſon walk in a ſinful Courſe, as to ſee a Spectrum a walking Ghoſt at Noon-day: We are buried with Chriſt in Baptiſm; *And how can we, who are dead to Sin, live any longer therein*? ſaith the Apoſtle. So that we are or ſhould be at leaſt as it were dead and buried to Sin; and that this may be the rather effected, and brought to paſs, we muſt be mortified as to the World. To this uſe the Apoſtle ſeems to apply the Argument of the Text in the following Chapter, to call off Mens affections from earthly Things, towards the Things that are above. There is acted a kind of Similitude upon the baptized to the Burial and Reſurrection of Chriſt. And we profeſs in a ſpiritual Senſe

to

to be dead to the World, and to be riſen again to a more Noble and Divine Life, ſo as to be above the World: And 'tis the Engagement of Baptiſm to be as it were dead and buried, with reſpect to the Things here below. Thus ſome interpret that of the 1 *Cor.* 15. 29. where the Apoſtle arguing againſt the Atheiſts and Sadducees who denied the Reſurrection, and the hopes of Glory in another Life, ſays, *What ſhall they do that are baptized,* ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, for dead Men, or as dead Men, into a mortification of this World, ſo as to run all Loſſes, Dangers and Hazards for the Profeſſion of Chriſt; ſuch would then be of all Men moſt miſerable, if things were ſo as the Sadducees and Atheiſts ſuggeſt. But certainly, there is a glorious ſtate of eternal Life hereafter, and therefore let us not be befooled with the Snares of earthly Vanities, to neglect things Eternal: Our Baptiſm engages us to live above the World, to be dead to it, to have mortified Affections to the things thereof. The World indeed affords lawful comforts for the living, and convenient reſting Places for the dead; but their Souls are above: So ſhould Chriſtians be in the World; uſe it, as it doth adminiſter to their neceſſities, and conveniences, but the Soul, the affections ſhould be above. We are not dead Naturally, and ſo there is need, and there muſt be a uſing of the World; but we muſt be dead ſpiritually to every thing in it, that is matter of allurement and temptation, to draw us aſide from God; and muſt be ſtrangers to ſuch immoderate cares and deſires,

ſires, as drown multitudes of Men in Perdition.

Laſtly, Let this ſerve to comfort thoſe whom God Honours ſo far as to bring them thus near unto himſelf; as to adopt them into his Family, and to take them for his own. Let this encourage them to believe in him, and to rely upon him for all the good things, that he hath promiſed in the Covenant of Grace. They of the Church of *Rome*, as in ſome things they give and aſcribe too much to Baptiſm, making it to take away original Sin, by the mere applying of the Ordinance; ſo in other things, they rob God's People of the comfortable uſe of it, becauſe they ſay, when once we commit actual Sins after the ſuſception of Baptiſm, we make Ship-wrack of our Baptiſm, and then Penance muſt be *ſecunda tabula poſt naufragium*; the only Pinnace or Plank which we can ſafely catch hold of in this extremity. But this bleſſed Sacrament is of a more durable and comfortable uſe, even to be an Ark, (whereto 'tis aſſimulated, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21.) to carry us to Heaven. 'Tis not a buſineſs paſt and finiſhed in the very Act of its Adminiſtration. There are in it Promiſes of ſuch Grace as we may ſtill have need of, and by its engaging us to Mortification and Holineſs, (the moſt comprehenſive Duties of Chriſtianity,) we may experience it to be an Inſtrument of Grace throughout the whole tranſaction of our Lives: That is, when 'tis from time to time improved, and actuated by a ſober Conſideration, and a ſerious Recognizing of the Baptiſmal Covenant,

and

and reflecting on the Terms and Conditions upon which we ſtand with God, with reſpect to Juſtification and Glory: And when the ſame is preſt home by the conviction of the Spirit. Theſe things being premiſed, we may readily Conclude, what an effectual Inſtrument and Means it may prove of converting the Souls of Men, and regenerating them long after the time of its reception. So that Holy Baptiſm continues ſtill to be altogether as effectual to apply the Blood of Chriſt, for waſhing away of Sin, upon true Repentance, as when we firſt received it. Know then, that when ever we find our ſelves at a loſs, ſenſible of our undone Condition, conſcious of our Guilt and Bondage through Sin, and ſo do fly by Faith unto Chriſt, and our Conſcience bears us Witneſs, that we would fain Walk for the time to come, according to the rule of the Covenant, in Uprightneſs and Sincerity; as often, I ſay, as we do this, we may have recourſe to our Baptiſm, and plead it for our Comfort; as we may plead the Rain-bow in great Inundations againſt the World's deſtruction by Water. Thus upon the renewing of our Repentance, and Faith in Chriſt, Holy Baptiſm will be as an Ark to the Soul in all Caſes of Relapſe, Deſertion, and Temptation. *For the like figure whereunto doth baptiſm alſo now ſave us*, ſaith the Apoſtle. Which that it may ſo prove to every one of us, and particularly to the Perſon that hath even now received it, *God of his infinite mercy Grant, for Jeſus Chriſt his ſake. To whom*, &c.

7 3166

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 5. *line* 19. *read* putting. *p.* 12. *l.* 12. *r.* token *p.* 17. *l.* 18. *r.* Gentiles. *p.* 18. *l.* 16. *r.* the Caſe. *p.* 19. *in marg. r.* Rodolpho. *p.* 28. *marg. l.* 30. *r.* Canon. *p.* 31. *marg. l.* 15. *r.* eâdem. *p.* 33. *l.* 30. *r.* Independent. *p.* 34. *l.* 32. *blot out* has. *p.* 76. *l.* 20. *blot out* as. *p.* 83. *l.* 13. *r.* not to be.

A Catalogue of Books Printed for, and ſold by John Taylor, *at the Ship in St.* Paul's *Church-yard.*

POOL's Annotations on the Holy Bible, in 2 Vol. The 4th Edition: Much corrected. *Folio.*

Philips's New World of Words; or an Univerſal *Engliſh* Dictionary, containing the Proper Significations, and Derivations of all Words from other Languages, *&c.* The Fifth Edition, with large Additions and Improvements from the beſt *Engliſh* and Foreign Authors. *Folio.*

Archbiſhop *Uſher*'s Life, and Letters, Publiſhed by Dr. *Parr*, his Grace's Chaplain. *Folio.*

Archbiſhop *Uſher*'s Sermons. *Folio.*

The Hiſtory of *England.* By Dr. *Frankland. Folio.*

Love's whole Art of Surveying, and Meaſuring of Land, made eaſie: With plain and practical Rules, how to ſurvey, protract, caſt up, reduce or divide any Piece of Land whatſoever. 4*to.*

Strode's New and Eaſie Method to the Art of Dyalling. 4*to.*

——— His Arithmetical Treatiſe of the Permutations, Combinations, Elections, and Compoſitions of Quantities. 4*to.*

Miracles perform'd by Money. A Poem. 4*to.*

Goodwin's

Godwin's Roman and *Jewiſh* Antiquities. 4*to.*

Biſhop *Hopkins* on the Lord's Prayer and Commandments. 4*to.*

Happy Union betwixt *England* and *Holland.* 4*to.*

Lord *Shannon's* Letter to an Atheiſtical Acquaintance. 4*to.*

Reaſons why a Proteſtant ſhould not turn Papiſt. 4*to.*

Rich's Epiſtle to the ſeven Churches. 4*to.*

Religio Militis. 4*to.*

Archbiſhop *Cranmer's* Judgment on the Holy Scriptures, Publiſht by Dr. *Gee.* 4*to.*

Baxter's Church Hiſtory and Epiſcopacy. 4*to.*

Mr. *Boyle's* free Enquiry into the Vulgarly receiv'd Notion of Nature. In *Engliſh* and *Latine.* 8*vo*

——— His Diſquiſition of the Final Cauſes of Natural Things. 8*vo.*

——— Of Languid and Local Motion. 8*vo.*

Abbadie of the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion. 8*vo.*

Quintilian's Declamations. 8*vo.*

Dr. *Newton's* Compleat Arithmetician. 8*vo.*

Counſellor *Manner's* Legacy to his Son. 8*vo.*

Ray's Nomenclator Claſſicus, ſive Dictionariolum Trilingue. A Claſſical *Nomenclator*, with the Gender and Declenſion of each Word, and the Quantities of the Syllables, *&c.* For the uſe of Schools. 8*vo.*

Robertſon's Large and General Phraſe-Book. 8*vo.*

Dr. *Owen's* Meditations of the Glory of Chriſt.

Yworth's whole Art of Practical Diſtillation. 8*vo.*

Biſhop *Hopkins* Sermons and Diſcourſes, in Four Volumes. 8*vo.*

Dr. *Salmon's* Practical Phyſick, ſhewing the Method of curing the moſt uſual Diſeaſes happening to Humane Bodies; the whole compleated in Three Books. 8*vo.*

Lord *Shannon's* Diſcourſes for the Modiſh Ladies and their Gallants. 8*vo.*

Mrs *Eliz. Walker's* Life and Character 8*vo.*